

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
TRUE DEITY
OF OUR
BLESSED SAVIOUR;

In Answer to a Pamphlet, Intitled,
*An Humble Enquiry into the Scripture
Account of Jesus Christ, &c.*

By JOSEPH BOYSE.

The Third Edition, Corrected

L O N D O N:

Printed for JOHN CLARK at the *Bible and Crown*
in the *Poultry* near *Cheapside*. 1719.

VERIFICATION

OF THE

TRUTH

OF THE

BY

THE



P R E F A C E.



VERY judicious and serious Christian, to whom the Interest of the *Gospel*, and the Glory of its blessed *Author* is valuable and dear, must needs resent it as the *Reproach* and *Inferlicity* of the Age wherein we live, that while the *whole* of *Revealed Religion* is run down on the one Hand by *Infidels* (under the Name of *Deists*,) *Some* of its most important Articles are no less violently assaulted on the other by such as pretend to the *Faith of Christians*. I know indeed our late *Unitarians* highly value themselves upon their numerous *Tracts* (with which the Press has of late Years swarm'd) as the breaking out of some glorious Light after a long Night of Darkness; and are ready to equalize *their* Attempt of overthrowing the Scheme of those they call *Trinitarians*, to that of our first *Reformers*, who opposed the Corruptions of *Popery*. But I must profess, upon a diligent and impartial View of their Writings, I am confirm'd in the Opinion, that they have (whatever their *Authors* might intend) much more promoted the Interest of *Infidelity* and *Deism*, than that of *Christianity*. I shall not at present dispute the Point with

A 2

them,

P R E F A C E.

them, why they engross this Title of *Unitarians* to themselves, when the *Unity of the Divine Nature* is not the Matter in Dispute between *them* and *us*. Unless they could shew us, That that Distinction, which we suppose to be between the *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, is inconsistent with any such *Unity*.

I foresee indeed they will be ready to enquire, Wherein I suppose that *Distinction* to lye, or what are the particular *Grounds* of it? But as to that, I am not ashamed to profess my Ignorance. I am contented to believe there is such a *Distinction* between the *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, as is a sufficient Foundation for the distinct Things that are in Scripture attributed to 'em, and yet such as does not imply the Multiplication of the undivided Divine Essence and Nature; tho' I cannot assign, or conceive the *particular Grounds* of the Distinction it self. For such a *Distinction* may be very possible (for any thing my Reason suggests to the contrary) in an *infinite Being*, notwithstanding the *Unity* of it, as is not to be found in any *finite Beings*, that have a *separate Existence*. And I think 'tis far more safe, and expresses a more becoming Reverence for divine Revelation to admit of such an Article (tho' there be much in the Manner of the Thing unsearchable to us) than to offer a continual Violence to the plain and frequent Declarations of the Holy Scriptures concerning the *Deity of the Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. And I think there is just Reason to say, That our late *Unitarians* have managed this Cause in a Manner that tends
very

P R E F A C E.

very little to the Honour of those *Sacred Writings*, which are the Standard and Test of our Religion. For what can more effectually lessen their Authority with the People, than for our Adversaries at every Turn to call in Question, whether this or that particular Text be *authentick* and *uncorrupted*? Nay sometimes to raise Objections against entire Books that belong to the Sacred Canon? And must it not needs weaken our Opinion of their *divine Inspiration*, to suppose that the Pen-men of 'em have in Matters of the highest Moment and Consequence (as particularly, when they ascribe the *Creation* to our *Lord Jesus*) us'd such Expressions as need all imaginable Subtleties of *Criticism* to expound 'em to another Sense, and reconcile 'em with what our *Opinions* suppose to be the Truth? Nay, how hard is it to preserve any Veneration for those Writings as *divinely inspir'd*, in which our Adversaries suppose so many Passages out of the *Old Testament* concerning the great *Jehovah*, apply'd to our *Blessed Saviour* in the *New*, meerly by Way of *Allusion* and *Accommodation*, when yet they appear to any impartial Reader produc'd as direct Proof of what the Apostles attribute to him? So that 'tis high Time for our *Unitarians* to apply themselves to the stopping the Progress of that *Infidelity*, which themselves have sown the Seeds of, by thus unsettling the Minds of so many in the Christian Faith thro' their over-eager Opposition to such important Articles of it, as the *Deity* and *Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour*. But yet I must upon second Thoughts tell 'em, That if they write against *Infidels* and

P R E F A C E.

Deists at no better rate than the late *Author* of the *Scandal and Folly of the Cross remov'd*, (See 4th Collect of *Unit. Tracts*.) it were much better they shou'd forbear intermeddling in that Dispute. For that *Author* has notoriously *betray'd* the Christian Cause he had undertaken to *defend*; and can find no way so proper to support the Credit of it with *Infidels*, as by giving up all its peculiar Doctrines that he thought might disgust and shock 'em. He is for making an easy *Composition* with 'em, and provided they will allow him a *few Matters of Fact*, (on which he'll put a Construction too as agreeable to their Relish as possible) he'll throw up all those *Articles of Faith* to 'em, that have been hitherto accounted the peculiar Discoveries of *Divine Revelation*. For in his *Preface* he undertakes to give the *Deists* an Account of the *true Fundamentals of the Christian Religion*, by which they are to judge of it, and not by the jarring *Opinions of the several Christians they converse with*. And those he has reduc'd to this narrow Compass, " *That there is a God, and*
" *an Eternal Life (ratified and confirmed by*
" *the Death and Resurrection of Christ) and*
" *that we must be entirely good Men, if we*
" *hope to be Partakers of it*. Nay he tells 'em, " *Revelation was proposed to no other*
" *End than to give sufficient Proofs of an*
" *Eternal Life*. And what modern *Infidel* or *Deist* will dispute any one of his *three Principles* with him? Nay how unreasonable were it in the *Deists*, when he goes so far to oblige 'em, if they should not meet him half way, and believe with him, that our *Blessed*
Sa-

P R E F A C E.

Saviour died and rose again to confirm that Doctrine of Eternal Life, which is their own Creed as well as ours ? They may it seems be good Christians upon their Belief of these three Articles, tho' they believe not one Word of that State of Corruption and Guilt into which Mankind is fallen, or of the Incarnation of the Son of God, or of his dying in our Place and Stead, as a Sacrifice of Attainment to the Justice of God, or of his Intercession in Heaven in vertue of such a truly Expiatory Sacrifice, or of our Justification by the free Grace of God, thro' the Redemption that is in him, or of the Necessity of the Renewing Grace of the Holy Spirit in order to our Regeneration and our continued Progress in Holiness ; such Doctrines as these (that have been hitherto thought the Principles of Revealed Religion) that Author seems very willing to discard, on pretence of recommending it to the Deists, and facilitating their Belief of it. In short, he requires 'em to take no new Doctrines into their Creed in order to their becoming Christians, but only some new Matters of Fact that tend to confirm the Dictates of Natural Light. To this purpose he tells'em again at p. 20. " That Christian Religion properly is nothing else but Natural Religion, " whose Light Sin had almost extinguish'd. " And God to give it its first Splendor, yields " up Christ to Death, which vindicates us from " the Slavery of Sin. So that Christ died to confirm no peculiar Doctrines of his own, but only those Dictates or Principles of Natural Religion that Sin had almost extinguish'd. Such as the three fore-mention'd Dictates, which he

P R E F A C E.

makes the *Fundamental Truths of the Gospel*, and with which our modern *Deists* will easily agree with him in Ranking 'em among their *Oracles of Reason*. So that his main Labour with the *Deists* is to reconcile 'em to this *Matter of Fact*, That *Christ died on the Cross*. And accordingly he is very careful to take away from the *Cross* it self, whatever might be a *Stumbling-block* to 'em. To that purpose, he assigns four *Reasons of the Death of Christ*: “ *The First is,*
“ *to attest the Truth of this Doctrine concern-*
“ *ing another Life, and seal it with his Blood.*
“ *The Second, That he must die in order to his*
“ *being rais'd again, whereby God confirms the*
“ *Truth of this Doctrine he taught concerning*
“ *another Life. The Third is, That he might*
“ *leave his Disciples an Example of suffering*
“ *for this Truth. The Fourth is, That his thus*
“ *dying to attest the Doctrine of Eternal Life,*
“ *by perswading Men of the Truth of it might*
“ *bring 'em to a good Life, and so free 'em from*
“ *Sin. And this (he tells us) is all that's*
“ *meant by Christ's becoming a Ransom or Price*
“ *of Redemption, his Giving up himself for us*
“ *that he might redeem us from Iniquity, &c.*
“ *His reconciling us to God by his Blood, his*
“ *bearing our Sins in his own Body, &c.*
These are all the *Reasons* that *Author* is pleased to assign of *Christ's Death and Sufferings*. But what then shall we make of all those numerous Expressions of Scripture that represent our *Blessed Saviour's Death* under the Notion of a *Sacrifice*? and speak of the *Expiation of our Sins by his Blood*, &c. And this in Allusion to those Expiatory Sacrifices offer'd under the Old Testament in order to the *appeasing*
of

P R E F A C E.

of *Divine Justice*? (For in this Notion of Expiatory Sacrifices, viz. That they were not meer Rites of Application to the Mercy of God, but offer'd to appease his Vindictive Justice, both Jews and Pagans were agreed). As to this, the *Author* tells us, "*That God in Con-*
descension to this Ignorance and Weakness,
and in order to put an end to all these Sa-
crifices, declares, That he has accepted the
Death of his Son (permitted for the four
Reasons above-mentioned) as the only Sacri-
fice that could please him, and procure the
Remission of Sin; meaning thereby only this,
(as he immediately explains himself) That
Christ's Death was an Act highly pleasing to
him, as Phineas's Act of Zeal was, by which
he is said to have made Attonement for the
Children of Israel, Numb. 25. 13. But all this while, there is not one Word of God's *declaring* in the Death and Sufferings of his Son, his *Righteousness* in the Punishment of Sin. Not one Word of Substitution of *Christ's Death* in the *stead of ours*, for demonstrating the Demerit of Sin, vindicating the Honour of God's violated Law, that threaten'd Death as the Wages of it, and rendring the Exercise of God's Mercy in the Pardon of Sin consistent with the Glory of his Holiness and Justice by such an Example of his *Severity* against it. So that the Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction* is dropt. His *Sacrifice* is but *metaphorical*; and all the Variety of Expressions in which 'tis represented in the Holy Scriptures, are but *pompous Allusions*, which at the bottom signify no such thing as *Christ's Death being a valuable Consideration offer'd to the injured Justice*
of

P R E F A C E.

of God for the Impunity of all believing and penitent Sinners. And thus to reconcile the Infidels to the Cross of Christ, he discards the main End and Design of his Sufferings on it. And assigns no other Reasons of his Death, but what the Death of any of his Apostles and Martyrs would have been as capable to attain and serve, if God had but pleased to send them first to preach this Doctrine of *Eternal Life*, and when they had died to attest the Truth of it, had rais'd 'em again.

But blessed be God, the *Christian Religion* needs not such treacherous *Defenders* as these. Nor can we receive *Deists* into the *Christian Church* upon such easy Terms as their believing one or two *Matters of Fact*, while they deny not only all the other peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel, but even that great *Mystery of Godliness*, *God manifested in the Flesh*. Such Proselytes to the Christian Church wou'd be no better than the most dangerous secret *Enemies* under the Disguise of *Friends*.

And as the *Unitarians* are coming over to the *Deists* in Point of *Doctrine*, so they are affecting a Conformity to 'em in one of the worst *Practices*. For if (as the ingenious Dr. *Nichols* tells us,) (a) "*The Latitudinarian Principle of joining in Communion with People of all Religions in their several Devotions, and complying with whatever Religion is establish'd, be the very Soul of Deism* ; I am sure our late *Unitarians* are come a good way towards it, when they have so frankly of late profess'd, That they can join in the Worship of those they call

(a) See Conference with a Theist, Part II. p. 81, 82, 83, 84, &c.

P R E F A C E.

Trinitarians, even tho' they know that such do avowedly give *Divine Worship* in the most exprest terms to our *Blessed Saviour* to whom they no way believe it to be due (b). But whatever they think of it, no serious Christian can think such palpable Dissimulation with *God* and *Men* to be excusable.

I have enlarg'd the more on these matters, to let the *Author* of the Paper I have undertaken to answer, see, What a Party of Men he is pleased to list himself among ; And whither their Dissent from the Christian Church, in the Point here controverted, is like to lead 'em. And as I cannot be so uncharitable as to think that he wou'd be willing to join with such Writers as these in so palpable a Design of undermining the Christian Religion, so I would not altogether despair of the Success of this Attempt to recover him from his Error, if he wou'd impartially weigh what is here offer'd to his Consideration. I am sure he will here find, That I have not only fairly represented his *Arguments*, but treated him with a *mildness* and *temper* that becomes so excellent a *Cause*, which needs not the Passions of Men for the Defence of it. And indeed my Respect and affectionate Tenderness for the supposed *Author* (the Perversion of whose valuable Abilities to so ill a purpose I heartily lament) were sufficient to restrain me from that Severity of Style, which his unreasonable Confidence, and his insulting Language in some Passages of his Book, wou'd not only have prompted one to, but perhaps in some measure justify'd. I remem-

(b) See the Paper in the III^d Collect. of Unit. Tract. Entitled, *The Scripturalist's Christian Condescension, consider'd.*

P R E F A C E.

bred the *Apostle's* Rule, of *instructing with meekness such as oppose themselves, if peradventure God may give 'em Repentance to the Acknowledgment of the Truth* (a). I have not therefore treated him *as an Enemy*. Much less have I had any Hand in his publick Prosecution on the account of the Book I have undertaken to answer (as some have very unjustly reported.) How far the *Author* acts from Conscience (tho' erroneous and misguided) in his present Opposition to this important Truth, I leave to God's Judgment and his own. But I cannot excuse his continuing so long in the Communion of a Christian Church, in which he cou'd not but know that Divine Worship was avowedly paid to that *Blessed Saviour*, to whom it seems he did not in his Conscience think it to be due. And if he thought his present Doctrine to be true, and a Truth of so great Importance, he shou'd in all Reason have more early and openly declar'd it, and not have contented himself with insinuating it only in a few occasional dark and ambiguous Terms. Divine Truth seeks not such Disguises, nor is it any great Argument of Sincerity or of a good Cause, to use 'em. But whatever effect this *Answer* may have upon *himself*; (For I am not insensible how difficult it is to remove those Prejudices that are deeply rooted, and especially where a Man's open Espousal of an Opinion engages his Reputation in the Defence of what he has once asserted;) Yet I hope it may be of some use to establish sincere Christians in the Faith of this Grand Article of *God manifested in the Flesh*, and to remove the Doubts of those (if there be any such among us) whom his *Paper* may have stagger'd. And 'tis

(a) 2 Tim. 2. 25.

P R E F A C E.

for this End that I thought it absolutely necessary, not to confine my self to the bare answering of the *Author's Paper*, without laying before the Reader a few at least of those numerous Arguments for our *Saviour's Divinity*, which the Scriptures abound with, and which our *Author* (with what Ingenuity and Candor I leave himself to judge) was pleased wholly to over-look. And 'tis that chiefly has drawn out this *Answer* to so great a length, and so long retarded the Publication of it. But I thought it far better to go once for all to the bottom of this Controversy by a thorough Examination of all the *Author's Objections* against our Doctrine, and comparing 'em with the Arguments on the other side, than to Content my self with a few hasty and slight Remarks on 'em. And as I thought myself under some particular Obligation to engage in this Dispute (tho' otherwise extreamly averse to it, least so excellent a Cause shou'd suffer by being in so weak Hands) so it encouraged me the more, when I consider'd, That the *Author* has fairly referr'd the Decision of this Controversy to the *Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, and has I think gone beyond any of our late *Unitarians* in producing the most plausible Objections against the *Supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus*, that a subtle Wit can draw from thence. But I must subjoin, That if any *Reply* be made to these *Papers*, in which the *Arguments* I have offer'd are not represented and examin'd with that Fairness and Candour, with which I have treated the *Author's* most plausible Reasonings on this Subject, but only *flurted* at with a few superficial Dashes of such a scornful unhallowed Wit, as appears every where in the Pamphlets
of

P R E F A C E.

of our late *Unitarians*, I shall not think my self any way concern'd in it. For I take this Subject to be of that vast Moment and Consequence, that it ought to be argued with the greatest *Seriousness* and *Gravity*, and with the *profoundest Humility* that a due Sense of our own Ignorance, and Deference to Divine Revelation, can inspire us with: And those are very unfit to intermeddle with, or be regarded in this Debate, who dare to handle it with a *profane Irreverence* and *insolent Buffoonery*. I shall only add, That I have left manifold *Arguments* for the *Supreme Deity of Christ* from the Scriptures wholly untouch'd, because I was willing to fix on, and vindicate those only, against which the *Author's Objections* were levell'd. So that 'tis not from the least distrust of their Strength that they are here omitted, but only to prevent this *Answer* from swelling to too great a bulk, which is already enlarged far beyond my first Intention. May he that is *the Way, the Truth and the Life*, give us his *Holy Spirit* to guide us into all necessary *Truth*, that we may grow in *Grace*, and in the *Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, To whom be *Glory both now and for ever, Amen!* 1 Pet. 3. 18.

J. Boyse.

CON-



C O N T E N T S.

THE Controversy concerning the True Deity of our Blessed Saviour, stated, from Page 1, to p. 6.

The First Argument for the true Deity of Christ from the Divine Titles given to him, p. 6.

What the Author objects against it consider'd, p. 6, 7, 8.

The true Deity of Christ proved from the Title of God over all blessed for ever, Amen, from p. 9, to p. 14.

The same prov'd from the Title of Lord of Lords, and the Author's Exceptions against it answer'd, from p. 14, to p. 21.

The Author's Argument against the Supreme Deity of Christ, from his speaking of God as distinct from himself, answer'd, p. 21, 22, 23.

His Second Argument from Christ's owning a God over or above him, answer'd, from p. 23, to p. 30.

The same Argument as reinforc'd, from 1 Cor. 15. 24, 25, &c. answer'd, from p. 30, to p. 37.

The Author's pretended Scriptural Account of the Deity of Christ, from John 10. 35, 36. and Heb. 1. 8, 9. refuted, from p. 37, to p. 41.

Phil. 2. 6. vindicated from the Author's Exceptions, from p. 42, to p. 47.

The Second Argument for the true Deity of Christ from the Divine Perfections and Works ascrib'd to him, p. 47.

The first Argument under this Head from the Perfection of Absolute Omnipotence, p. 49.

That such Absolute Omnipotence belongs to Christ, prov'd from the Work of Creation's being ascrib'd to him, ibid.

That the Scriptures ascribe the Creation to him, prov'd against the Socinian Unitarians, from p. 49, to p. 63.

That the ascribing the Creation to our Blessed Saviour demonstrates his absolute Almighty Power, prov'd against the Arian Unitarians, from p. 63, to p. 68.

The Author's Arguments against this absolute Omnipotence of Christ, from John 5. 19, &c. answer'd, from p. 69, to p. 74.

The second Argument from Absolute Goodness, That this is ascrib'd to our Lord Jesus Christ, prov'd, p. 74, 75.

The Author's Reasoning against it, from Matth. 19. answer'd, from p. 76, to p. 78.

The third Argument from Absolute Omniscience, p. 79.

That

CONTENTS.

- That this is ascrib'd to our Blessed Lord, prov'd from such Passages as attribute to him the Knowledge of all things, and the Argument vindicated from the Author's Exceptions, from p. 79, to p. 82.*
- The same prov'd from such Passages as attribute to him the Knowledge of the Heart, p. 83, 84, 85, 86. The Author's Exceptions against this Argument, refuted, from p. 87, to 92.*
- The Author's Argument against the absolute Omniscience of Christ, from Mark 13. 32, answer'd, p. 92, 93.*
- The Author's 5 Remarks to reinforce his foregoing Arguments, especially the last, answer'd, from p. 94, to p. 108.*
- The Third Argument for the True Deity of Christ from the Divine Worship due to him, p. 108.*
- The Notion of Divine Worship stated, p. 109.*
- That the Scriptures require us to pay Divine Worship to our Blessed Saviour prov'd, from p. 109, to p. 119.*
- The different Opinion and Practice of our Adversaries in this Point, and particularly that of the English Unitarians, and of our Author, from p. 119, to p. 122.*
- The Author's Arguments against giving Divine Worship to our Saviour answered, from p. 123, to p. 129.*
- The Unreasonableness of the Socinians in giving Divine Worship to him, while they believe him only a dignify'd Man, proved, and the Charge of Idolatry on this Account made good, from p. 129, to p. 133.*
- The Opinion and Practice of the Unitarians and the Author in giving an inferiour Religious Worship to our Blessed Saviour prov'd to be highly injurious to him if he be truly God. If he be not, injurious to the Honour of God, who is the sole Object of Religious Worship, and tending to justify both Pagans and Papists in their Demon-Worship, from p. 133, to p. 142.*
- The Author's Objection against the True Deity of Christ from his Office of Mediator answered, from p. 142, to p. 149.*
- His Object. from Act. 2. 22. answered, from p. 149, to p. 152.*
- His Instances of the Unsteadiness of Protestant Writers in dealing with the Papists, and with the Unitarians, considered, from p. 152, to p. 155.*
- His general Reflections at the End of his Book animadverted on, from p. 155, to the End.*



A
VINDICATION
OF THE
TRUE DEITY
OF OUR
BLESSED SAVIOUR, &c.



HE Doctrine of our *Blessed Saviour's Divinity* has been so fully reveal'd in the Holy Scriptures, so universally receiv'd in the Christian Church, and is so apparently interwoven with the whole Scheme of our Holy Religion, that there needs no Apology to be made for a seasonable Defence of it, when 'tis so openly attack'd, and with so unusual a Confidence. It wou'd be rather most inexcusable not to contend for this part of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, when the Honour of our Blessed Lord, the Peace of his Church, and the Salvation of Souls, are so greatly endanger'd by the violent Opposition made to this important Truth.

B

I shall

I shall at present consider a Pamphlet wrote on this Subject, entitled, *An Humble Enquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ, or a Short Argument concerning his Deity and Glory according to the Scriptures.*

I shall not enlarge on what is obvious to every one's Observation, viz. How little the *Title* agrees with the *Strain* of the Book. For few that read it with an unprejudic'd Mind can think that the Author has made his Enquiry with due *Humility*, when they consider that he has in his Paper manifestly overlook'd the clearest Proofs of the Essential Deity of Christ in the Holy Scriptures, and only put together such Passages as he thinks make against it, and yet on that very partial Representation of the Arguments on *one side*, has pronounc'd against the Received Doctrine of the Christian Church with as much Confidence, as if he had clearly answer'd all the Arguments alledg'd on the *other*.

Nor is it any great Argument of the *Author's* Candour and Sincerity to entitle his Paper, *An Argument concerning the Deity and Glory of Christ*, when the whole Design of it is to divest him of the Glory of that true *Deity* which the Christian Church ascribes to him, and to degrade him to the Rank of a meer *dignified Creature*. But we must forgive him that he was willing for avoiding popular Odium, to cover an *Heterodox* Book with an *Orthodox* Title.

That I may therefore do some Justice to this important Subject by setting it in its true Light, it will be requisite not only to answer what the Author has alledg'd against the true Deity of Christ, but to suggest some few at least of those manifold Proofs of it which the Holy Scriptures so abundantly furnish us with; the due Consideration whereof will in a great measure take off the Force of his main Objections against it.

To state the Question aright, we must briefly consider, what kind of *Deity* the Christian Church ascribes

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 3

ascribes to our Blessed Saviour, and what our Author is willing to grant him.

What the Christian Church believes concerning the *Deity* of Christ, presupposes the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, viz. That tho' there is but *One God*, One divine and infinitely perfect Being, yet that this *One God*, is some way *Three* as well as *One*; That he is *Father*, *Word* (or *Son*) and *Spirit*. That the Perfections of the one undivided Nature of God are as truly ascribed to the *Word* and the *Holy Spirit* as to the *Father*; and yet that the *Word* and the *Holy Spirit* are by peculiar relative Properties, and by a different manner of Subsistence and Operation, distinguish'd from the *Father*; some things being ascrib'd in Scripture to the *One* that are not to the *Other*.

Now, tho' the Holy Scriptures reveal to us such a *Trinity* in the *Unity* of the divine Nature; (as particularly by requiring us to be *Baptiz'd in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit* (a); By ordering our being *blest'd* in the Name of each of these sacred *Three* (b). (See also 1 *Joh.* 5. 7---). Yet how this *One God is Father, Word, and Spirit*, they have neither fully reveal'd, nor are we probably in this imperfect State capable clearly to apprehend. We do indeed see some Resemblance of a *Trinity in Unity* in created Beings themselves. We see the same *Sun* to be the distinct Fountain of *Motion, Light, and Heat*. We see the same *Souls of Brutes* to have distinct Powers of *Vital Motion, Sense, and Appetite*. We can discern in our own *Souls* a clear Distinction between our *Vital Power, Understanding, and Will*. Nay, we see in *Corporeal Beings* themselves a threefold Dimension of *Length, and Breadth, and Depth*. Now that manifest Distinction in Created Beings which we find to be so entirely consistent with their Unity, gives us just Ground to con-

(a) *Matth.* 28. (b) 2 *Cor.* ch. 13. v. 13.

clude, That 'tis very possible, and no way contradictory to any solid Principles of Reason, that there may be a much greater *Distinction* in an infinite Being fully consistent with the *Unity* thereof. And therefore, if the Scriptures assert such a *Distinction* in the Divine Nature; if they distinctly ascribe not only to the *Father*, but to the *Word* and *Holy Spirit*, the peculiar *Titles*, *Perfections* and *Operations* of the *Divine Nature*, and require us to pay *Divine Homage* to each of these *Sacred Three*; We ought to entertain with Humility and Reverence what the Blessed GOD has thus discover'd concerning his own infinite Nature, without any curious Enquiries beyond the Line of Divine Revelation, How these *Sacred Three* are distinguish'd from each other, and yet are *One True God*.

For we do believe several particular Perfections of the Divine Nature, tho' our Understandings are involv'd in the like Difficulties how to form any clear distinct Ideas of 'em, or solve all the Objections rais'd against 'em. We firmly believe the same God to be *Eternal*, tho' no Man can define to us what *Eternity* is, and how 'tis distinguish'd from, and yet co-exists with the *Successive Duration* of Temporary Beings. We believe the *Immensify* of God, tho' we cannot clearly conceive, How an undivided Being can be everywhere present, without something analogous to the *Extension* of Corporeal Beings. And we believe the *Divine Prescience*, tho' no Man can explain, How the contingent Actions of free Agents can be certainly fore-known by the Divine Understanding, nor answer all the subtle Arguments that may be rais'd against it. Nay, we that meet with so many things in our selves, and in the minutest Creatures round about us, that are beyond our reach to comprehend, should not at all wonder that in such a Declaration as the great God gives of his own Infinite Nature, there should be some things to us *Unsearchable*: It would rather be strange if it were otherwise.

• Now

Now this Paper which I design to examine, only opposing the *Deity* of one of those Sacred *Three*, I shall apply my self to the Defence of that.

As to the Author's Opinion, he does not seem very clear in stating the Question relating to the *Deity of our Blessed Saviour*.

For one while he proposes it, "*Whether Christ be the God of Gods, or above all Gods ? For this*" (he tells us) *is the highest and most glorious Title given to God in the Old Testament, when it is designed to make the most magnificent Mention of his peerless Greatness and Glory.*

But foreseeing perhaps that Christ, who is over *Angels*, whom he tells us the Scriptures call *Gods*, may be therefore stiled according to his own Hypothesis *God of Gods* ; he seems willing to shift the *Question*, and reduce it to this, *Whether Jesus Christ has any God over him, who has greater Authority and greater Ability than himself, or no ?*

Now this State of the *Question* is unfair, and liable to just Exception. For *Jesus Christ* is a complex Subject, which (according to the avowed Faith of the Christian Church) includes in it, both his *Divine Person* (on the Account whereof he is called the *Word*, and the *Only Begotten of the Father*) his *Human Nature*, and his *Office of Mediator*. Now in some of these respects 'tis true that *Jesus Christ* has a *God over him* ; in others, 'tis not. So that his bare proving, That in some respects (as particularly that in reference to his *Human Nature*, or to his *Mediatory Office*) he has a *God over him*, will by no means prove, that he is not the *God of Gods*, or *Supreme God*, as he is the *Word*, and the *Only Begotten of the Father*.

The true State then of the *Question* between him and us is, Whether Christ as the *Word* and *Only Begotten of the Father*, be only a *Created Finite Being*, tho' raised to eminent subordinate Authority over all other Creatures, or be a *Being of infinite Perfections* ? Whether under this Character and Consideration he be *God* in a *Proper Sense* as that denotes

a *Being of infinite Perfections*? Or be God only in a *Figurative Sense*, as that Word imports a most dignify'd Creature, or (in our Author's Language) a *Being in Subordinate Power*? And 'tis evident, That our Author allows him to be no otherwise God than in this *Figurative Improper Sense*: For he denies any of those *Infinite Perfections* to belong to him which are the Properties of the *Divine Nature*. So that our Blessed Saviour is no more with him than a Creature rais'd to the highest Authority over his Fellow-Creatures; or, as he speaks, *The chief of Subordinate Powers*.

My Business then is to shew, That the Scriptures represent that *Word* that was made *Flesh*, that *Only Begotten Son of the Father* that came into the World, and was *Partaker of our Flesh and Blood*, to be the most *High God* in the *Proper Sense* of the Word, viz. *A Being of Infinite Perfections*, and not a *Creature and Finite Being*, who is only call'd *God* on the Account of his *Eminent Dignity and Authority* over his Fellow-Creatures.

Now this I shall endeavour to prove from the peculiar *Titles* of the supream God, (or infinitely perfect Being) that are given to our Blessed Saviour; from the *Divine Worship* due to him; from the incommunicable *Works and Perfections* of God ascrib'd to him. And under each of these *Heads* I shall have Occasion to examine and answer what the *Author* has alledg'd to the contrary.

I begin with

I. The Argument drawn from the peculiar *Titles* of the *Supream God*, (or the infinitely perfect Being) which are given to our *Blessed Saviour*.

As to this, our Author tells us, "*It is not deny'd by the Arrians and Socinians that the Blessed Jesus has the Title of God ascribed to him sometimes in the Scriptures. But the Question is, In what Sense?*" And having told us, That the Word *God* in Scripture sometimes signifies the *Supream Being*, sometimes *Persons invested with subordinate Power*, as *Angels or Magistrates*, he concludes, "*That the bare Character*
" of

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 7

“ of God determines nothing in this Case, because it belongs both to the Supream and Subordinate Beings in Power and Authority.” And therefore proposes the Question, *Whether Jesus Christ be God of Gods, or above all Gods?* Which he supposes the peculiar Character of the supream Being.

In Answer to this, We do not pretend that the bare Title of *God* given to our Saviour is a demonstrative Proof of his being the most High God, for the Reason he alledges that *Angels* and *Magistrates* are also called *Gods*. But we must distinguish between that Title being given in a proper Sense, and in a figurative (and by a *Catachresis*.) And 'tis apparent that where that Title is given to *Creatures*, 'tis either given in the Plural Number (as to *Angels* and *Magistrates*;) or if given in the Singular Number, 'tis in such a particular Sense, and under such Circumstances and Limitations as plainly shew 'tis apply'd only in a figurative Sense; as in the Instance the Author gives of *Moses* being a *God* to *Aaron* and *Pharaoh*. Tho' as to the former, *Exod.* 4. 16. 'tis only said *Moses* should be to *Aaron* instead of *God*; which plainly shews in how improper a Sense the Word is us'd. And this explains what is said of *Moses* being a *God* to *Pharaoh*, viz. That he should represent *God's* Authority in commanding, and exert his Power in punishing *Pharaoh*. So the *Devil* is called the *God of this World*, not only on the Account of his usurped Dominion, but because he was worshipp'd by the idolatrous World.

Now when we argue for the Divinity of Christ from this Title of *God*, we not only insist upon its being frequently given to him, (which it is not to any created Being, these few being the most plausible Instances that can be alledg'd) but from its being given without any Limitation, or any Circumstances that should lead us to a figurative Sense of the Words; nay, on the contrary, in a Manner that leads us to take the Title in its true and proper Sense.

There is no Appearance of any such *Limitation* and *figurative Sense*, when our Blessed Saviour is call'd *Immanuel*, or *God with us*, *God manifested in the Flesh*; when he has the Title of *Κύριος* or *Lord*, (which in the Septuagint answers to that of *Jehovah*) given him throughout the whole New Testament; when he is call'd the *true God*, 1 *John* 5. 20. (For that that Title belongs to him, appears not only from the ordinary grammatical Construction of the Words, but from its Conjunction with that other Title of *Eternal Life*, which in the Beginning of that Epistle, c. 1. v. 2. is given to *Christ* as distinguish'd from the *Father*.) When he is call'd the *Great God*, *Tit.* 2. 13. (For that that Title belongs to our Saviour is evident from hence, That the *glorious Appearance* there mention'd is never attributed to the *Father*, but always to our *Blessed Lord*.) But especially when so many Things spoken of the great *Jehovah* in the Old Testament are so manifestly applied to our *Blessed Saviour* in the New. See among many other Instances such as these: *Isa.* 28. 16. *Joel* 2. 32. compar'd with *Rom.* 10. 11, 12, 13, 14. So *Eph.* 4. 8. compar'd with *Psal.* 68. 18. 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. compar'd with *Numb.* 21. 6. So *Rev.* 1. 8, 11. and 22. 13. compar'd with *Isa.* 44. 6. And many other such Passages, some of which I shall have Occasion to speak of.

But to bring this Matter to a shorter Issue; If it appear that such *Titles* as are *peculiar* to the *Supream God*, and *incommunicable* to any *finite Being* how dignify'd soever, are given to our *Blessed Saviour* in the Holy Scriptures, the Argument from such *Titles* will hold good to prove his being the *Supream God*. Our Author seems to allow, that if *Christ* were called the *God of Gods*, or a *God above all Gods*, it would prove his Divinity in the proper Sense of the Word. Now the Proof is as cogent from any other *Titles* that are equally appropriated to the *Supream Being*, and *incommunicable* to any *finite created Being*.

As to such *incommunicable Titles*, I shall only insist on those *two* given to our *Blessed Saviour*, that of *God over all blessed for evermore*, and that of *Lord of Lords*.

First, I would argue from that glorious *Title* ascrib'd to our *Blessed Saviour* of *God over all blessed for evermore*.

The Apostle *Paul*, speaking of the *Jews*, saith of 'em, *Whose are the Fathers, of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for evermore, Amen. Rom. 9. 5.*

To make the Force of this Argument appear, it will be only requisite,

I. To shew that this *Title* is here given to our *Blessed Saviour*.

II. That 'tis the peculiar incommunicable *Title* of the *Supream God*.

I. It will be requisite to shew, That this *Title* is here given to our *Blessed Saviour*.

And 'tis the more needful to clear this, because tho' *Socinus* himself freely gives up this Point, yet I find our late *Unitarians* generally chuse rather to evade this Text, by telling us, that these last Words in the Text are not a *Description* of our *Blessed Saviour*, but only a *Doxology* to the *Father*, and therefore should be render'd thus, *Of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came, God who is over all be blessed for evermore, Amen.*

Nay, some late *Unitarians* have presumed to tell us, 'tis probable the Word *God* was not originally in the Text. But this Pretence of theirs is so fully confuted by the late Bishop of *Worcester* in his *Vindication of the Trinity*, p. 154, 155, &c. and by Dr. *Whitby* in his *Paraphrase* on this Passage, p. 48, 49, that I shall refer the Reader to those learned Authors for entire Satisfaction in that Point. I shall only add, that the *Unitarians* pretend their turning the Words into an Ecphonema and *Doxology*, is countenanced by the Addition of *Amen*, which they tell us there was no Occasion for, if the Words were intended as a *Description* of our *Lord Jesus*.

But

But the Vanity of this Evasion will appear if we consider the following Particulars.

1. That (as *Socinus* himself well observes) when the Word *Ευλογητός* or *Blessed* is intended by Way of *Doxology*, it ought to be put *before* the Person to whom 'tis applied, not *after* him. So that if the Apostle had intended the Words for a *Doxology* they should have run thus, *Ευλογητός ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς Ἀμήν*.

But I may farther add, that *Ευλογητός* is never put for *Ευλογητός ἔσω*, but where the Sense is imperfect and defective without supplying the *Verb*; whereas there is no *Ellipsis* or Imperfection at all as the Words lye in the Original: So that the supplying any such Verb has these two intolerable Faults in it; the *one*, that 'tis altogether unnecessary, the Sense being compleat without it; the *other*, that the supplying any such Verb quite alters the Sense and Purport of the Words as they are in the Original, turning 'em to another Subject, without any ground for it. Nay, I may justly add, the Words *ὁ ὢν* in the Original are absolutely *necessary* and *useful*, if we understand the Passage as a *Description* of our Blessed Saviour; whereas they are not only *useless* if we understand 'em as a *Doxology*, but *dangerous*, as tending to misguide us to interpret of *Christ* what the Apostle, according to our Adversaries, intended only of the *Father*. The Reader must excuse such *Criticisms*, when our Adversaries use all imaginable Subtily to wrest such plain Texts from us. We are in this Case forc'd to fight 'em at their own Weapons.

But farther,

2. That the Apostle intended not this for a *Doxology*, appears, because he is always wont in his *Doxologies* to mention the Benefits conferr'd on such on whose Account he offers 'em. But this he had no Occasion for here: Not only because these Privileges he mentions as appertaining to the *Jews*, and particularly that of *Christ's Carnal Descent from 'em*, were Privileges separable from Salvation, but because he here considers the *Jews* as like to lose all

all the Advantage of 'em thro' their own wretched Infidelity, and on that account expresses his *Extreme sorrow of heart* for 'em, v. 2. So that he here mentions *Christ's coming*, not as *matter of Joy* to them, but like to turn to the Aggravation of their Guilt and Misery.

3. There was very just Occasion for the Apostle to add these words as a *Description* of our Blessed Saviour.

It was very fit that when the Apostle, among other Eminent Privileges appertaining to the Jews, mentions this, *That of them Christ came as concerning the Flesh*, that he shou'd enhance the Privilege by considering the *Dignity* of the *Person* that came, and his Superiority to those of whom he came. Especially when we consider, That the Apostle so carefully limits what he had said of *Christ's coming of them*, That 'twas only [*τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*] as concerning the *Flesh*. Whereby he plainly intimates, there was something to be consider'd in him more than that *Flesh* or *Humane Nature* he deriv'd by his Descent from them. And what it was he represents to 'em in this *glorious Title*, *who is over all God blessed for evermore*. And 'tis observable that every thing in that *Title* is oppos'd to their false opinion of him. they thought him a *Meer Man*; the Apostle tells 'em, He was *God*: They thought him inferior to the *Fathers*; the Apostle stiles him, *God over all*: They accounted him *accurs'd*; the Apostle stiles him, *Blessed for evermore*.

I shall only add, That the Addition of *Amen* is no Proof at all of the words being a formal *Doxology*; not an *Affertion*, because 'tis elsewhere added upon the mention of this *Title*, where there is only an *Affertion*, no formal *Doxology*. 'Tis so in this very Epistle, (a) *They served and worshipped the Creature more than the Creator, who is God blessed for evermore, Amen*.

(a) Chap. I. v. 25.

But as to the Author, I need the less insist on this, because in discourse on this Subject he own'd these words as a *Description* of our *Blessed Saviour*, but expounded 'em of his being the *chief of those subordinate Powers* that are call'd *Gods* in Scripture.

I come therefore

II. To shew, That this of *God over all, blessed for evermore*, is the *Incommunicable Title* of the *God of Gods*, or the *Supreme God*. And this will sufficiently appear, if we consider

I. This Title is no where else in Scripture given to any *Created Being*, or *Subordinate Power*, but always to the *Supreme God*.

I cannot find that this Title of *God Blessed*, or *Blessed for evermore*, occurs oftner than four times in the New Testament. (For as to the word *Blessed* apply'd to God, 1 *Tim. cap. 1. v. 11.* and 1 *Tim. cap. 6. v. 15.* 'tis not in the Original *Ευλογητός*, but *μακάριος* or Happy. However 'tis there also appropriated to the most High God). And in every one of those places 'tis manifestly apply'd to the most *High God*. 'Tis so in the Question propos'd by the *High-Priest* to our Saviour, *Art thou Christ the Son of the Blessed?* 'Tis so in *Rom. 1. v. 25.* (of which more anon.) 'Tis so 2 *Cor. 11. v. 31.*----- Where the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* is describ'd in Expressions plainly parallel to those here us'd concerning our Saviour, *ὁ ὢν Ευλογητός εἰς αἰῶνας*, *who is blessed for evermore*. And I hope the peculiar Addition, *over all*, cannot be thought any Diminution of this Illustrious Character: For that is also elsewhere given to the Father (c). I may therefore here justly challenge our Adversaries to produce any other Place where this Title is given to any Creature how dignify'd soever. And if they cannot, How unreasonable is it to suppose this the Character of a *Creature* here, which is every where else appropriated to the most *High God*? Nay, 'tis observable, that where any Creatures are in the New Testa-

(c) Eph. 6.

ment called *Blessed*, the word is not *Ευλογητός*, but *Ευλογημεν* &c. See *Luke* 1. 42. where 'tis apply'd to the *Blessed Virgin*, and to the *fruit of her Womb*, the *Man Christ Jesus*. Nor is that Observation of Dr. *Hammond* groundless (as *Monfieur Le Clerk* wou'd represent it) concerning the ordinary Custom of the Jews to add to the Name of God this Title of *Blessed for evermore*. And had the Apostle believ'd our Saviour to be no more than a dignify'd Creature, he cou'd not have put a greater Stumbling-block before the Jews to harden 'em in their Infidelity, than by giving him a Title and Character which they had always appropriated to the great *Jehovah*. For he might be sure they wou'd take these words to be an Ascription of *Divinity* to him in the most strict and proper Sense. So that the Apostle could not have spoken more unwarily and dangerously to the Prejudice of the Christian Cause, had he been of the Opinion of our late *Unitarians*; but nothing could have been added more seasonably and justly, according to the received Doctrine of the Christian Church. But

2. This Argument is the stronger, if we consider, That this Character is given to the most *High God* as *distinguish'd from all Creatures whatsoever*.

'Tis so in that foremention'd place, *Rom.* 1. 25. where the Apostle charges the Gentiles with *worshipping and serving the Creature more than* (or rather *beside*, *παρὰ*) *the Creator, who is God blessed for evermore, Amen*. The *Creatures* the Gentiles serv'd were many of 'em such *Demons* and *Deceased Heroes*, as they suppos'd to be *subordinate Powers*, but rais'd to the Dignity of *Gods*; From all these the Apostle distinguishes the true God the Creator of the world by this Title of *God blessed for evermore*. q. d. That God, to whom alone the Blessing and Adoration of all intelligent Creatures is and will be for ever due. Now with how little Justice cou'd the Apostle fix this severe Reproach on the *Gentile Philosophers*, (for of them he here speaks) when they might from his other Epistles retort his own Argument upon him. "Can it be
" such

“ such a Crime in us to worship a *Creature*, besides
 “ the *Creator*, when you your self propose a digni-
 “ fy’d *Creature* as an Object of Religious *Adoration*,
 “ to whom you tell us, every *Knee* shou’d bow, and
 “ every *Tongue* confess his *Dominion* (a); nay, when
 you even cloath this exalted *Creature* with so glori-
 ous a Character as that of *God* over all *Blessed* for
 evermore, which you here give to the *Creator*; nay,
 when in other Writings you ascribe the *Creation* to
 him (b)? Can that then be *Idolatry* in us that is
 none in you? And shou’d the *Unitarians* here sup-
 pose the *Apostle* to alledge for himself, That he
 did not give to *Christ* *Supreme*, but only *Subordinate*,
Worship (as our *Author* himself professes he does)
 (c): The *Gentiles* wou’d readily alledge the same
Distinction, to justify their *Worship* of those *Crea-*
tures whom they suppos’d to be exalted to the dig-
 nity of *inferior Gods*. The *Apostle* might indeed blame
 ’em for their ill Choice of those *subordinate Powers*
 they worship’d, but cou’d never justly, upon the
 Principles of our *Adversaries*, charge them as *Idola-*
tors for *worshiping the Creature beside the Creator*, who
 is *blessed God* for ever; when the *Apostle* himself,
 and all *Christians*, (if they were of our *Author*’s
 Opinion) did *worship a Creature besides the Creator*,
 nay, under the very *Title* of *God*, nay, of *God* over
 all *blessed* for ever. But of this I shall have occasion
 to speak more fully under the *Argument* drawn from
 the *Divine Worship* due to our *Blessed Saviour*.

Secondly, I would argue from that other *Title*
 ascrib’d to our *Blessed Saviour*, viz. *Lord of Lords*,
Rev. 19. 16.

And I the rather chuse to insist on this, because
 our *Author* owns indeed this *Title* to be given him,
 but endeavours to disprove this *Inference* drawn from
 it.

To this purpose he tells us, “ That the *Title* of
 “ *Lord of Lords* denotes an *Inferior Character*, com-

(a) Phil. 2. v. 10.

(b) Col. 1. v. 16.

(c) See pag. 17.

“ par’d

“ par’d with that of *God of Gods*, as appears by
“ that *1 Cor. 8. 5.* tho’ it be included in the Su-
“ perior; so that he who is above all Gods, is also
“ over all Lords, but not contrariwise, *p. 2.*

Ans. That the Title of *Lord of Lords* notes an
Inferior Character compar’d with that of *God of Gods*,
so that he may be *Lord of Lords*, who is not *God of*
Gods, is not only asserted by the Author without
any solid Proof, but against the Current of the holy
Scriptures, which do as truly appropriate the Title
of *Lord of Lords* as that of *God of Gods* to the great
Jehovah, or *only true God*. See in the Old Testa-
ment, *Deut. 10. 17. The Lord your God is God of Gods,*
and Lord of Lords, a great God, mighty and terrible, &c.
So *Pf. 136. 2, 3.* And in the New Testament, *1 Tim.*
6. 15. the great God is describ’d as *the Blessed and*
only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.
And indeed if that Title of *God of Gods* set that *Be-*
ing to whom it is given above all *Gods* whatsoever,
and imply there is no *God above him*; there is the
same Reason why the Title of *Lord of Lords* shou’d
set him to whom it is given above all *Lords* whatso-
ever, and imply that there is no *Lord above him*. But
this the Author will by no Means grant to be true of
our *Blessed Saviour*, and therefore is forc’d against the
Strain of Holy Writ to suppose there are *two distinct*
Beings, (one *Finite*, the other *Infinite*) to whom yet
the same Character of *Lord of Lords* does belong:
Whereas the aforementioned Text makes this to be
the Title of him who is the *Blessed and only Poten-*
tate, who therefore has no *Rival* with him in this
glorious Character.

And *St. Thomas* seems not to have been of the *Author’s*
Opinion in this point, but on the contrary to
have supposed the Title of *Lord* and *God* equally due
to the same Object of Religious Worship, when he
cries out in his devout Address to our Blessed Saviour,
My Lord and my God, John 20. 28.

And I may here justly add, That the Title of
Lord of Lords is equivalent to that of *Lord over all*.
Now the Title of *Lord over all* is made by the A-
postle

postle *Paul* equivalent to that of *Jehovah* in the Old Testament, and yet in the same Place is given by him to our *Blessed Saviour*. He cites from the Prophet *Joel* those Words, *He that calls on the Name of Jehovah shall be saved, Rom. 10. 13.* Whom the Prophet stiles *Jehovah*, he calls *Lord over all, ver. 12.* And that by that *Lord over all* he understands our *Blessed Saviour* is evident from the following Verse: For it was *him* the Apostles were sent to *Preach*, and to invite both Jews and Gentiles to *Believe* and *Call upon, v. 14.* (Of which more will occur under the Argument from Divine Worship.)

But our Author refers us for Proof of what he says, That the Title of *Lord of Lords* denotes an Inferior Character, to *1 Cor. 8. 5.*

But if it be enquir'd, How this appears from that Text? I see not what the Author has offer'd to prove it, unless we will take for Proof of it what he saith in the second Column of the second Page, which I shall carefully consider.

“ How manifestly (*saith he*) are the One God
 “ and One Lord distinguish'd? *1 Cor. 8. 6.* And
 “ that there may be no Pretence to say with *Plac-*
 “ *us*, That the God, and the Lord, or the Cause
 “ of which all Things are, and the Cause by or
 “ thro' which all Things are, are but two Things
 “ said of the same one God, We may see 'em more
 “ clearly distinguish'd, *Eph. 4. 5, 6.* where by inter-
 “ posing other Things between the One Lord and
 “ One God, *viz. One Faith, One Baptism*, it ap-
 “ pears evidently, That these were not intended as
 “ two Characters of the same Being.

Answ. To clear this, I may justly premise that the Title here given to our Blessed Saviour is not *Lord of Lords*, but the *Lord by whom are all Things*. Nay, tho' it should be granted to our Author that the bare Title of *Lord* may sometimes note one in Office inferior to the *Father* (which he has yet no way prov'd) yet this wou'd make nothing for our Author's Purpose against the true *Deity of Christ*, unless he could shew us, That Christ's being call'd the *Lord by whom*
 all

all Things are, did imply him to be only a dignify'd Creature, and so a Being distinguish'd from the Father in Nature and Essential Perfections. For the Son of God may be in respect of Office inferior to the Father, and sustain a Character inferior to his, without any Inequality in respect of Essential Perfections, (as I shall have Occasion to shew afterwards.)

Now that the Apostle does not by the Lord by whom *all Things are*, intend a meer dignify'd Creature, distinguish'd from the Father in point of Essence, Placeus has offer'd several Reasons to prove, which our Author has offer'd no Reply to, and the Author produces but one Argument against it, which has no manner of force.

As to Placeus's Arguments I shall only mention and enforce these three.

1. Because this Supposition alone can render the Apostle's Reasoning solid and clear.

The Apostle had asserted, *That an Idol in the World was nothing*, according to the known Doctrine of the Old Testament, that brands all the Deities of the Gentiles as *Vanities* and *Nothings*: i. e. All the Objects of the Worship of the Gentiles were nothing in point of *real Divinity*. On the contrary he asserts, *That there is none other God but one*. And how do's he prove this? 'Tis by this Argument, *For tho' there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or Earth, (i. e. tho' the Heathens have a multiplicity of Gods both Celestial and Terrestrial) as there be Gods many, and Lords many, (i. e. as there are many such Demons whom the Heathens own'd as Gods and Lords)* (a) But to us (i. e. to us Christians) *There is but One God the Father of whom are all Things, and we in (or for) him: And One Lord Jesus by whom are all Things,*

(a) That this is a just Paraphrase of the Apostle's Expressions in opposition to the Paraphrase of the Socinians, re-advanc'd of late by Monsieur Le Clerk, who understands by Gods and Lords. Angels and Magistrates, I must refer the Reader for fuller Satisfaction to Dr. Whitby's Paraphrase, p. 141. where he will see that new Exposition solidly confuted.

and we by him. Now if we suppose the Apostle to describe that *One God* (whose *Unity* he intended to prove in Opposition to the Pagan *Polytheism*) according to *two different Manners of Subsistence and Operation*, which are peculiar to the *Father* and the *Son*, viz. The *Father* as the *Cause of whom all Things are*, and we in or for him, The *Son* as the *Cause by whom all Things are*, and we by him, The one distinguish'd by the Character of *God*, The other of *Lord*, we make him argue consistently with *himself*, as well as with the receiv'd Doctrine of the *Christian Church*. And even tho' *Lord* shou'd denote a lower Character belonging to *Christ as Mediator*, yet if he to whom 'tis given be in respect of his Nature *God* as well as the *Father*, still the Apostle argues consistently, and well proves, That Christians have *no other God but one*, because they own but *one Father* that sustains the Rights of the *Deity*, and *one Lord* that is the *Administrator* of the Divine Kingdom, and is One in Essence with the *Father*.

But on the other hand, if we suppose, That the Apostle by *One Lord* means only a *Dignify'd Creature*, a Being entirely distinct from the true God, and yet a *God by deputation*, His Way of Reasoning will be very unaccountable and strange. For according to this Supposition the Apostle proves there is *no other God but One* in opposition to the Heathens Polytheism. How? Why, because tho' the Heathens have many *Gods* and *Lords*, yet we Christians have but one *One God* the *Father*, who alone is *God by Essence*, and *One Lord*, who is *God by Office and Deputation*. Which in Effect is to prove, that to Christians, *There is no other God but One*, because to them there are but *Two*, *One Essential God*, and another *Made God*, *One God by Nature*, and another by *Office*. Besides, if we suppose with the *Unitarians*, that the Apostle intends *One God*, with that Limitation, of *One that is God of himself* and by *Nature*, we ought in all Reason to apply the like Limitation to *one Lord*, and understand it of One who has this Lordship and Dominion of *himself*. But this wou'd
over-

overturn their Opinion concerning our *Blessed Saviour*, whose Dominion they will by no means allow to be *from himself*.

2. And this Argument will appear the stronger, if we add to it, That the Exposition of our Adversaries wou'd give the Gentiles a fair handle to justify their Worship of their *Inferior Deities*.

For the Learned Pagans might justly retort on the Apostle, We own as well as you, *That there is but One God*, i. e. One who is *God of himself*, and the *Supreme God*; but it will not thence follow, that all the Inferior Demons we worship have nothing of *Divinity* in 'em, and that no Worship is due to 'em. For we suppose 'em constituted as *Inferior Gods* by the Favour of the *Supreme God*, on the Account of the *Lordship* and *Dominion* he has delegated to 'em. We suppose that he has advanc'd 'em to that *Dignity*, and allows our paying 'em an inferior *Religious Homage*. (a) Now what do we in this Matter more than you Christians, who besides that *One God that is of himself*, own another *God*, and pay a Religious Homage to him, even to one who is but a *God by Courtesie* and *Deputation*? So that if our *Demons* are but *Fictitious Deities*, to whom no Worship is due, there is as little due to your *Made God*, who is as meer a *Nothing* in point of true *Divinity* as *ours*. All that I can see capable of being reply'd is, That the Heathens were mistaken in thinking their inferior Deities to be constituted such by the *Supreme God*; but still their Argument, according to the *Unitarian Hypothesis*, sufficiently clears their *Demon-worship* from being *Idolatrous*. Of which more will occur under the Head of *Worship*.

3. I may justly add, That to be the *Cause by whom are all Things*, is the peculiar Character of the *True God*, and therefore cannot be the Character of a meer *Dignify'd Creature*.

(a) See *Celsus* making this very Plea for Demon-Worship, *Cels. ap. Orig.* l. 8. p. 381, 421.

'Tis mention'd as the Character of the *True God*, That of him, and thro' (or by) him, and to him are all Things, Rom. 11. 35. And this Phrase is apply'd to Christ, when the Work of Creation is ascrib'd to him, Eph. 3. 9. Col. 1. 16. (which I shall anon shew to be the peculiar Work of the *True and Supream God*). And therefore those *Arrians* are plainly mistaken who tell us, that this Phrase, *All Things are by him*, denote only a *Finite Instrumental Cause* subservient to the *First*. Whereas it appears from the fore-cited place, that this Expression is applied to the *First Cause*, *By whom*, as well as *Of whom*, all Things are. All Things are of the *Father*, by the *Eternal Word*. And this is agreeable to *Joh. 1. 1, 2.*

Nor can our Adversaries justly pretend, that the Apostle's saying, *To us there is but one God the Father*, do's exclude all but the *Father* from being *God*. For, by the same Reasoning, these Words, *To us there is but one Lord*, wou'd exclude all but *Christ* from this Character of *Lord*. (As several of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* very well argue in commenting on these Words.)

But our *Author*, instead of making any Reply to *Placæus's* Arguments, pretends to overturn 'em all with one Objection, viz. "That we may see the One God
"and One Lord more clearly distinguish'd, Eph. 4.
"5, 6. Where by interposing other things between the
"One Lord, and One God and Father, viz. One Faith,
"and One Baptism; it evidently appears, That these
"were not intended as two Characters of the same
"Being.

But how do's this evidently appear? It do's indeed appear, that the Apostle distinguishes between that *One Lord*, and the *Father*. But how do's it appear, that he distinguishes between 'em, as between two *Beings*, the one whereof was only a *Finite Dignify'd Creature*, the other *Uncreated and Infinite*? Why may not the same *God*, according to one manner of Subsistence and Operation be call'd *God the Father*, and according to another different manner of Subsistence

sistence and Operation be stiled in respect of his Mediatory Kingdom *Lord*? And why may not these *Two* that are distinguish'd from each other in their manner of Subsistence, their relative Properties, and their Characters in the Oeconomy of our Salvation, be mention'd distinctly, and at some Distance in the same Paragraph, without supposing 'em to be distinguish'd from each other in respect of Essential Perfections, or without supposing 'em to be two such distinct Beings as *God* and a meer *Dignify'd Creature* are? Especially when those Words, *One Faith*, and *One Baptism*, are fitly mention'd after *One Lord*, as the genuine distinguishing Characters of those that belong to his Mediatory Kingdom. If the Author see any Force in his own Argument, he must excuse us that we do not, but think there is incomparably greater Strength in the Arguments on the other side, which he thought fit to take no Notice of.

I shall only add under this Head, that the very Title of *Lord*, *Κύριος*, so universally given to our Saviour thro' the New Testament, and answering to that of *Jehovah* in the Old, has been enlarged on as a Proof of our Saviour's Divinity by the *Bishop of Sarum*, (a) whose Reasoning on that Head the Author has not thought fit to take any Notice of.

Having thus far pursued the Argument from the peculiar Titles of the *Supreme God* being given to our Blessed Saviour, it will be proper for me under this Head to take Notice of the two first Arguments he advances against the true *Divinity* of our Blessed Saviour.

His first Argument is, "*That our Lord Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God distinct from himself. Several times we find him saying, My God, of another. Matth. 27. 26. My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Sure he intended not to say, My self, my self, why hast thou forsaken me? This God was then distinct from himself, as he declares in other Places,*

(a) See the Bishop of Sarum's Four Discourses, from pag 110. to pag. 121.

“ John 7. 17. *He shall know of my Doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I spake of my self. So*
 “ John 8. 42. *Where 'tis to be noted that he does not distinguish himself from him as the Father, but as God. And therefore in all just Construction he cannot be suppos'd to be that self-same God, from whom he distinguishes, and to whom he opposes, himself.*

Answ. 'Tis something strange, that the Author shou'd take no notice of what had been briefly offer'd in Answer to this Argument in the *Remarks on Mr. E——'s Case*. But sure he can never expect this Argument shou'd stagger those who believe that there are *Two Natures* united in our Lord Jesus, unless he had first overthrown that important Article of our Religion. (What he has offer'd afterwards will be consider'd in its due place.) Christ as *Man* distinguishes himself from *God*, therefore the *Word* to which his Human Nature was united, cannot be *God*, tho' apparently call'd so. Where is the Consequence? All the Force of the Argument lies in this, That whenever our Lord Jesus speaks of himself, he must be necessarily suppos'd to include all that is in his Person. But this is a manifest Mistake. Our Author himself grants, That that may be affirmed of a Person which belongs only to a part of him, *p. 8*. And nothing is more usual in our common Forms of Speech than to apply that to our selves, which is true only of a Part of our compounded Nature; as one may say, I my self was wounded, or sick, when only his *Body* is so, not his *Soul*. Thus our Lord Jesus saith to his Disciples after his Resurrection, *Behold my Hands and my Feet, That 'tis I my self, For a Spirit has not Flesh and Bones, as ye see me have.* Where he calls his *Body*, *Himself*. And what if we shou'd hereupon argue as our Author, That our Blest Saviour had no *Soul* or *Spirit*, because he speaks of himself as distinct from a *Spirit*, and therefore cannot be suppos'd to have any *Spirit*, from which he distinguishes, and to which he opposes, himself: Wou'd he take such Reasoning for any better than
 weak

weak Sophistry? And why may not our Lord Jesus then call his *Human Nature Himself*, as well as his *Human Body*? Why may he not as *Man* distinguish himself from *God*? And the Author knows well enough, it was as *Man* that he suffer'd those Agonies on the Cross, and as *Man* that he came to reveal the Will of God to the Sons of Men. But the Author shou'd tell us, how we shall reconcile his Argument with Christ's being so often and expressly stiled *God*, whereas he supposes him always distinguish'd from *God*? And he can no way solve the Difficulty without that Distinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office*. So that the Debate will come to this, Whether of these Distinctions be more conformable to the Strain of the holy Scriptures, viz. Our Distinction of two Natures in the Person of our Blessed Saviour, with which we solve the Passages he mentions; or his Distinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office or Deputation*, to which he must flee to reconcile those Passages in which Christ is distinguish'd from *God* with those wherein he is called *God*. We can shew him our *Distinction* clear in several Passages, (as 1 *John* 1. 14. *Rom.* 9. 5. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) But we cou'd never yet discern any Footstep of the other in the holy Scriptures, which assure us, that to us, (Christians,) *There is no other God but One.* 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. And the very first Command strictly forbids our owning any other as *God* but him, *Exod.* 20. 3.

And this leads me to what he adds under this Argument from that fore-cited Text, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. But having already consider'd his weak Reasoning from that Passage, p. 16, 17, &c. I shall refer the Reader thither; and come to his

Second Argument, viz.

“ Our Lord Jesus not only owns another than himself to be God, but also that he is above or over himself. Which is plainly also imitated by the Apostles. Himself loudly proclaims his Subjection to the Father in many Instances. In general he declares his Father to be greater than he, *John* 14. 28, 50. and 10. 29.

“ He saith, he came not in his own, but his Father’s,
 “ Name and Authority. John 5. 43. That he sought
 “ not his own, but God’s, Glory; nor made his own
 “ Will, but God’s, his Rule. And in such a Posture
 “ of Subjection he came down from Heaven to this
 “ Earth. So that it shou’d seem that Nature that did
 “ præ-exist did not possess the supreme Will, even be-
 “ fore it was incarnate, John 6. 38. Again, he owns
 “ his Dependance on his God and Father, even for
 “ those Things which ’tis pretended belong to him as
 “ God, viz. the Power of working Miracles. John 5.
 “ 19, 20. Of raising the Dead, v. 26. Of executing
 “ universal Judgment, v. 27. Of all which he says,
 “ Of my self I can do nothing, v. 30. In like manner
 “ his Apostles declare his Subjection to another; not
 “ only as his Father, but as his God, which is most
 “ emphatically expressed in calling the most Blessed God,
 “ the God of our Lord Jesus, after his Humiliation
 “ was over, Eph. 1. 17. And the Head of Christ is
 “ God, 1 Cor. 11. 3. They declare his Headship over
 “ the Universe, and the very Foundation of his Claim
 “ to Honour and Service, to be owing to the gracious
 “ Gift of God, Phil. 2. 9. And yet these are some of
 “ the highest Glories of Jesus Christ.

Answ. That this Argument is of no Force against
 the true Deity of our Blessed Lord, will appear if we con-
 sider, That God the Father may be above Christ in se-
 veral Respects, which yet are no way inconsistent
 with his being One God with the Father, and that
 the Scriptures cited by our Author under this Head
 are to be understood only of the Father being above
 him in some of those Respects.

I. I shall shew, That God the Father may be said
 to be above Christ in several Respects, which yet are
 no way inconsistent with his being One God with the
 Father.

Now the Father may be said to be above our Lord
 Jesus in these three Respects.

1. With respect to his Humane Nature. Who can
 doubt but a temporary dependent Creature is every
 way inferior to that Eternal Almighty Being that
 made him?

2. With

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 25

2. *With respect to the Eternal Generation of his divine Person, as he is the only Begotten of the Father.* We acknowledge a Priority in the Order of subsisting to be peculiar to the *Father*, who is therefore called the *Fountain of the Deity*. The *Father* and *Son's* having the same Nature do's not destroy the order of *Persons*. A *Son* is equal to his *Father* in respect of the *Human Nature* he derives from him, but yet inferior in that *Relative Capacity* of a *Son*. And on this account the *Father* is sometimes in Scripture call'd *God* by way of Eminency, and propos'd as the ultimate Object of religious Worship; Eph. 2. 18. *Thro' him (i. e. thro' Jesus Christ) we have Access by one Spirit to the Father, i. e. to the divine Nature as primarily subsisting in the Person of the Father.*

3. *With respect to his Office as Mediator.*

In *One God* we believe there is *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. And that there is between these sacred *Three* that Distinction which is a sufficient Foundation for their distinct Actings towards each other, of which there are evident Instances in the mysterious Oeconomy of our Redemption. In which the order of *working* follows that of *subsisting*. The *Father* sustains the Place of supreme offended *Lawgiver*. The *Son* by a voluntary Dispensation assumes our Nature, and interposes as an *Atoning Mediator*. And this is a wonderful Instance of the Condescension of the *Eternal Word*, that tho' he was *God equal with the Father* in respect of essential Perfections, yet his compassionate Regard to us induced him to accept a Station and sustain a Character in order to our Recovery, in which the *Father is greater than he*; yea, in which he was in the Nature he assum'd to be humbled to such an astonishing Degree, as to be *Obedient to Death, even the Death, of the Cross, to be despised and rejected of Men, as well as smitten of God.*

And in this Capacity of *Mediator*, after he had finish'd the Work of his humble State, he was crowned with Glory and Honour, and deservedly advanc'd to a sovereign Dominion over all, that in the Administration

stration of his Mediatorial Kingdom he might accomplish the eternal Counsels of the divine Will. And in this state of Exaltation his Human Nature has an eminent Degree of Dignity and Glory above any other created Being conferr'd upon it, which was not its original Right, but the Reward of his Condescension and meritorious Obedience and Sufferings.

Now, tho' under each of these Considerations God the *Father* is above the *Son*, yet none of 'em is inconsistent with the *Son's* being *God by Nature*.

Not his being Man. For tho' as *Man*, he is not *God*; yet he, who is *Man*, is also *God*. For the Apostle sure do's not speak Contradictions and Impossibilities, when he tells us, *That of the Father as concerning the Flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for evermore.* And that divine *Word* who was *with God*, (and so distinguish'd from the *Father* as to his *Manner of Subsistence*) and who *was God*, (and so was one with the *Father* in *Essence*) even this *Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*, John 1. 1, 14.

Not his being the Son of God, in respect of his *Eternal Emanation* from the *Father*. His *Personality* abstractedly consider'd do's not formally include the *divine Essence*, but only the *Manner* of his having it, viz. by a necessary *Eternal Communication* from the *Father*, in a manner to us incomprehensible. So that his being the *Son of God*, and being *God*, are no more incompatible than a *Thing* and the *Manner* of it.

Nor is his being Mediator inconsistent with his being *God*. For this Office is altogether a *voluntary Dispensation*. Suppose a *Father* and *Son* to be jointly possess'd of the same sovereign Power, and to *Reign* together. Upon the Rebellion of their undutiful Subjects, may not the *Son* leave the Rights of his Sovereignty in his *Father's* Hands, and take upon him the Office of a *Reconciling Mediator*, without being divested of the Crown? This is some Illustration of the Case before us, tho' it do's not fully reach it. He who is the *Mediator* is also *God*. He was
God

God who purchased the Church with his own Blood, Acts 20. 28. And since it was the marvellous Condescension and Love of the Son of God that brought him into this Relation of a Mediator, what can it be but most unreasonable Ingratitude to turn this Fruit of his unconceivable Pity into an Argument against his Deity?

Thus we see in what Respects our Lord Jesus may be own'd to be *Inferior to the Father*, and that none of 'em are inconsistent with his being the *same God by Nature*.

I therefore proceed to shew

II. That all the Passages of Scripture which the Author produces may be understood of our *Blessed Saviour* under some of these Considerations, and therefore do not disprove his *being Partaker of the same divine Nature with the Father*.

The first Place he mentions is, "*My Father is greater than I*, John 14. 18.

Ans. If we suppose our *Saviour* to speak this of himself as *Man*, there is no Difficulty at all. And the Context favours this Interpretation, because he speaks of his bodily Presence with 'em, of his *leaving 'em and going to the Father*, and under this Limitation adds, *My Father is greater than I*. And that he do's not mean himself in the whole of what was in his *Person*, is evident, because in some Sense *he was in Heaven already*, (See John 3. 13.) and cou'd not in that Sense speak of his *going thither*.

But we may without any Prejudice to our Cause grant him much more, That our *Saviour* speaks of himself as *Mediator*, and in that Sense assert, *That the Father is greater than he*. For tho' in respect of his *divine Nature He and the Father are One*; yet in this Relation of *Mediator* he was the *Servant of the Father*, and sent by him, Isa. 42. 1. And indeed had our *Blessed Saviour* been no more than a *Man*, his Assertion, that the *Father is greater than he*, wou'd carry but a jejune Sense with it. For who cou'd ever admit any Doubt about the *Infinite and Eternal Jehovah* being greater than any *finite temporary Being*?

Whereas

Whereas if he speak of himself as *Mediator*, the Assertion was very proper and needful.

And this may also obviate what the Author next "objects from *John* 5. 43. 6. 38. That our *Saviour* "came down in his *Father's Name*, That he came "down from Heaven not to do his own *Will*, but the "Will of him that sent him; Upon which he puts "this Gloss, That it was in a *Posture of Subjection* "that he came down from Heaven to the *Earth*; so "that it shou'd seem that *Nature* that did *præ-exist* "did not possess the *supreme Will*.

Ans. I am glad to find that the Author will allow to our *Blessed Saviour* such a *præ-existent Nature*, but sorry he speaks so very doubtfully of it; least, I suppose, he shou'd disoblige his *Socinian Friends*. But as to his Objection, I freely grant him, That it was the *Will of the Father* which the *Man Christ Jesus* came to fulfil. And as *Man*, his *Will* was doubtless distinct from the *Will of the Father*, and entirely *subject thereto*. Nay, tho' we shou'd understand these Expressions concerning that *præ-existent Eternal Word* that was *Incaruate*; it wou'd not hence follow, That the *Eternal Word* had not the same *Will* also, but only that in this *Oeconomy of Things*, *God the Father*, who was first in order of Being, was consider'd as the first Spring and Mover, by whose Appointment the *Son* came as *Mediator*, not to pursue any particular *Will* of his own, which was not the *Will* of the *Father* also. Nor is it inconsistent with the *Son's* being *God*, to say, that in the *Quality*, or under the *Character*, of *Mediator*, he came into the *World* (*i. e.* was *Incaruate*) in a *Posture of Subjection*.

Again, as to those Passages wherein our *Lord Jesus* owns his Dependance on the *Father* for those Things that belong to him originally as *God*, as the *Power of working Miracles*, *Raising the Dead*, and *executing universal Judgment*, *John* 5. 19, 20, 26, 27. They either refer to his *human Nature*, or to his *Office of Mediator*, for the Discharge whereof we own his Authority to be delegated and deriv'd. And those

Words

Words of our Lord lead us to this Exposition, in which he tells us, *That the Father has given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man*, v. 27. Where he both intimates in *what Nature* he was to *Execute Judgment*, viz. *as the Son of Man*, and the very *Reason* of the *Father's* conferring that Honour upon him as *Mediator*, even because *he is the Son of Man*, i. e. has condescended to be *Incaruate*, and take our Nature on him.

But as to his saying, *That of himself he cou'd do nothing*, John 5. 30. 'tis not incongruous to suppose that he design'd thereby to assert his Union in *Nature* with the *Father*, as *One Energy* or *Principle of Operation*; because when he uses the same Expression, v. 19. he adds, *What Things soever the Father do's, the Son do's likewise*; (which can never be true of a meer *Created Being*, unless we make it *Omnipotent*;) and that as the *Father bath Life in himself*, so *he has* (by an *Eternal Communication*) *given the Son to have Life in himself*, v. 26. i. e. the same *Essential Life*, which according to the Order of subsisting is first in the *Father*.

And it seems partly for this Reason, that the Apostle *Paul* calls the *Father* so often the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; not only his *God*, as his *human Nature* was his *Workmanship* and *Creature*; but his *Father*, because the *Godhead* or *Divine Nature* is communicated by the *Father* to the *Son*, on which Account he was stiled in the ancient Creeds, *God of God, Light of Light*.

In this Respect also the *Head of Christ is God*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. *Christ as Mediator and Redeemer* is but a *Means* for the Manifestation of the *Essential Glory of God* to the intellectual World.

Nay, we do acknowledge his *Dignity and Glory as Mediator* (in which that *Human Nature* he assum'd so eminently shares) to be the *Gift of God*, and *Fruit of the Father's* infinite Complacency in his forward and chearful *Obedience unto Death, even the Death of the Cross*. According to what he cites from the Apostle *Paul*, *Phil. 2. 7, 8, 9*.

So

So that in all these Places there is no Intimation of any such *Subjection* or *Inferiority* of the *Son*, as shou'd exclude him from being, in respect of his *Nature* and *Essence*, the *same God* with the *Father*.

But the *Author* under this Head singles out one Text, which he tells us "*is full of irresistible Evidence for proving an Inferiority of the Son to his Father, or to God, viz. 1 Cor. 15. from 24 to 29.*"

I shall therefore recite the Text, and premise what may clear the genuine Sense and Scope of it, and then examine the Inferences our Author draws from it.

The Text runs thus,

Ver. 24. *Then cometh the End, when he (i. e. Christ) shall have deliver'd up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power.*

25. *For he must reign till he hath put all Enemies under his Feet.*

26. *The last Enemy that shall be destroy'd is Death.*

27. *For he hath put all things under his Feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted who did put all things under him.*

28. *And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

Now in order to the clearing the Sense and Scope of this Text, I must premise, that there is a twofold Kingdom of Christ, his *Essential* and his *Mediatory* Kingdom.

His *Essential* (which some call his *Natural*) Kingdom, belongs to him as he is the *Eternal Word*, by whom all Things were made, and without whom not any Thing was made that was made, John 1. 3. For this Dominion is the unalienable Result of Creation, common to *Father*, *Word*, and *Holy Spirit*. Now of this Kingdom there shall be no End. His *Throne* (on this Account) is in the strictest Sense, for ever and ever, Heb. 1. 8. Even that *Throne* which he possesses as the *Lord* who in the Beginning laid the Foundation of this Earth, and the Works of whose Hands the Heavens are. See Ver. 10. This Kingdom he
can

can never give up. He by whom the Worlds were made, will for ever be the absolute Proprietor and Lord of those Worlds he gave Being to.

But besides this, there is a *Mediatory Kingdom of Christ*, which was erected on the Occasion of our *Apostasy*, and is the wonderful Expedient contriv'd in the Divine Counsels for our *Recovery and Salvation*. For after our Lord Jesus had in our Nature made Atonement for Sin by becoming obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross; he was in that Nature highly exalted, had all Power and Authority in Heaven and Earth committed to him, was made Head of his Church, and Head over all Things to it; nay, has Angels, Principalities and Powers subjected to him (a); so that the Administration of all Affairs is in his sacred Hands. Now the Establishment of this Kingdom we readily grant to be a free Act of God the Father, who is therefore said to appoint it to him. In this Sense God his God has anointed him, and made him both Lord and Christ (b). But this Kingdom is so far from being inconsistent with his true Deity, that without it the Human Nature were absolutely incapable of managing so universal and extensive a Dominion, which reaches both to this visible, and to the superior invisible World. (c)

Now if this Passage of the Apostle must be understood of this *Mediatory Kingdom*, 'tis evident that his Inferiority to the Father in respect of this his Mediatory Office and Kingdom, will no Way prove his being Inferior to him in respect of his Nature and Essential Perfections. So that we might dismiss the Author's Reasonings, as not reaching the Matter in Dispute. But since he lays so great a Stress on 'em, let us briefly consider 'em.

1. He

(a) Phil. 2. 8, 9, &c. Matth. 18. 18. Eph. 1. 21, 22.

(b) Heb. 1. 9. Acts 2. 36.

(c) Rev. 1. 18. For Hades should there be rendred the *unseen World*, or *invisible State*, equally including the Mansions of Glory, and the Place of Torment.

1. He observes, "That God is excepted out of those things that are put under the Feet of Christ, and that because it was he that put them under him. All this we freely grant.

But our Author here enquires, "How comes it to pass that 'tis so evident a thing that another must be the Author of this Triumph of Christ? Why might it not be done by himself independently as the Supreme God, and then there need have been no Exception of any one Being out of all the things under him? But the Apostle knew that Jesus Christ must needs triumph by a Power derived from God, to whom it was most eminently to be ascrib'd. And then to one who had such Thoughts, it was manifest that there must be one excepted from all the things under him, because he must needs be above Christ, who enables him to subdue all things, or makes him a God over all.

Ans. We grant that the Father is the Author of this Dignity and Triumph of our Exalted Lord Jesus. And there is this evident Reason why the Eternal Word shou'd not confer this Dignity on the Human Nature, to which it was united, but the Father only, because in this Oeconomy the Father alone sustains the Character of Supreme Lawgiver, the Son only that of Mediator. And as such he was to act only by a Power derived from the Father, who in this respect is consider'd as above him. But this does by no means prove that the Word or Son is not God by Essence. And for the Author's Phrase of Christ's being made by the Father, God over all, we look upon it as both irrational, and wholly unscriptural. A Made Creator, or a Made Self-existent Being, is a Contradiction in Philosophy. And a Made God is a new Notion unknown to Scriptural Divinity. For a Made God is by Nature no God, and such as are by Nature no Gods, we are neither oblig'd to own nor serve, Gal. 4. 48. Of which more hereafter.

The Author observes, "That the Son shall deliver up this Kingdom to God the Father only, since it was
" the

“ *the Father who gave him all Power in Heaven and Earth, &c.*

We grant it, that as this *mediatory Kingdom* was the *Gift of the Father*, and was design'd only to be an Administration of a temporary Continuance, till the Reason of first erecting it should cease; so when the great Ends of it are attain'd, when the Mystical Body of Christ shall be compleated, all Enemies subdu'd, the World judg'd, and the Salvation of all given to our *Blessed Lord* by the *Father* fully consummated, then the Work of Christ as *Mediator of Reconciliation* shall be finish'd. (As the *Physician's* Work in the *Hospital* is over when all his *Patients* are perfectly recover'd and cur'd.) And then the *derived Power* of Christ as *Mediator* will be return'd into the *Father's* Hands; tho' our *Lord* himself shall on the Account of it for ever inherit the Praises of his Ransom'd People. But still all this makes nothing against his *Divine Nature*, as he is the *Eternal Word*.

3. The Author farther observes from this Text, “ *That the Son himself shall be subject to him that puts all things under him, i. e. (to God his Father); that God may be all in all, i. e. his Subjection shall be then manifested by an open solemn Acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognize the Supremacy of the Father in that publick Act of Surrender, &c. and hereupon he concludes, can any thing be more expressive of an Inequality between God and Christ?*

Ans. We freely grant, that when the *Mediatory Kingdom* of Christ is deliver'd up, that *Human Nature* in which he administer'd it shall appear in the same State of Subjection to the *Father* as *Angels* and *glorified Saints* do. So that as Christ was before *All in All* (in the Administration of all Affairs relating both to the *Church*, and the *World*, Col. 3. 11.) So now all things will revert to their natural Order. And *God* essentially consider'd (as inclusive of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*) shall be *All in All* for ever; there being no need of such a *Mediator* between *God* and his *Saints*, when they are rais'd to a State of sinless Perfection.

But our Author being aware of this Answer has endeavour'd to obviate it. Accordingly he proposes it by Way of *Objection* to his Argument.

" *It will (saith he) be said by some, that by the Son is meant here the Son of Man, or Christ as Man, while as God he shall not be subject to the Father.*

To this he answers, " *That as there is no Intimation of any such Distinction between the two pretended Natures of the Son here, so there is enough in the Words to shew, That they are spoken of him in his highest Capacity and Character. Insomuch that Mr. Claude maintains it to be true of the Son of God as to his supposed Divine Nature. But tho' there is no need of supposing such a Divine Nature (which I think the Text plainly contradicts) yet his Reasons will hold so far as to prove, that the Words speak of Christ under the highest Character he bears under the Name of Son.*

Ans. If the Author had dealt fairly by Mr. Claude, he shou'd not only have represented his Exposition of these Words, but what he offers to shew, That that Subjection of the *Eternal Son of God* to the *Father*, which he allows, is consistent with his *Divinity*: And shou'd have then refuted his Exposition, and not expected that we shou'd take it for granted on his bare Word, *That the Text contradicts Christ's having such a Divine Nature.* Nor do I wave that *Exposition* as *indefensible*, since that *Subjection* may be understood of the *Son's* Inferiority to the *Father* in respect of the *Order of Subsisting and Acting*, being then manifested. But since I prefer the other *Exposition*, I shall examine the Reasons the Author subjoins to prove, that the Words must be understood of the *Son in his highest Capacity and Character.*

His first Reason is, " *Because 'tis not said, the Son of Man, but the Son absolutely, even the Son himself, with great Emphasis, q. d. as great and glorious as he is with all his Grandeur and Power.*

Ans. The *Son* is the Name of the Person of Christ; and tho' it be often apply'd to him with reference to his *Divine Nature*, yet 'tis sometimes mani-

manifestly apply'd with respect to his *Human Nature*. 'Tis so *John* 5. 22, 27. And tho' he saith, that it undoubtedly implies all that comes under the Title of *Son*; I do as positively affirm, that it does not so always, and shall afterwards particularly shew it does not, from *Mark* 13. 32.

Nay, tho' the Apostle add *the Son himself* by Way of Emphasis, yet this will not prove that he includes his *highest Character*, but only refers to his *Kingdom and Power as Mediator*, which he had describ'd before. Even this *Son himself* who *shall reign till he have put down all Authority and Power*, shall then *himself be subject*.

His second Reason is, "*That his Subjection being oppos'd to his Reign, both must be understood of the same Subject. Be sure the delivering up the Kingdom can only be done by the same to which it was committed, and by which it was managed. Now I shall allow that only in his human Nature Christ could give up his Kingdom, because 'tis as Man delegated and inhabited by God that he manages this Kingdom.*"

Ans. To make this Argument cogent, the Author must assert, that Christ's *Reign as Mediator* includes his *highest Character*. But this I deny: His *Divine Nature* is a *higher Capacity* than his *Office of Mediator*.

And tho' we grant him, that the *delivering up the Kingdom* can only be done by him to whom it is committed, and by whom 'tis manag'd, yet we do not say, as the Author would feign for us, that *Christ could give up his Kingdom only as Man*. For he will do it as *Mediator*. 'Tis not as meer *Man*, but as *God Man*, that he sways and manages his *Mediatory Kingdom*, and shall *deliver it up*, tho' 'tis only in the *Human Nature* that he will be *subject*. And therefore his Vindication of the *Unitarians* from this Ground, who think our Lord *Jesus a sufficient Saviour*, tho' he be not the *Supreme God*, is it self groundless. (As I shall have Occasion to shew when

he re-assumes and prosecutes this Argument at Page 14.)

I shall only take Notice of what he adds at the Close of this Reason.

" That the Delivering up the Kingdom to God the Father makes it plain there is no God the Son, in the same Sense, or the same supreme Essence, with the Father. Because if there were, then he ought not to be excluded from this Glory of having such open Homage paid to him, which is here appropriated to the Father only. And since the Apostle speaks of the same God (whom he explains to be the Father) to the End of this Discourse, and saith, he shall be all in all, how evidently does he shew him to be far beyond all that are not God the Father, whatever Character else they bear. So then Jesus Christ in his highest Capacity is inferior to the Father, how can he be the same God to which he is subject, or of the same Rank and Degree?

Ans. The whole of the Mediation of Christ being a voluntary Dispensation; and the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, having different Parts ascrib'd to 'em in the great Affair of our Redemption and Salvation; 'tis no Absurdity to suppose that each of 'em may have a Glory accruing from thence that is peculiarly his own. We are sure the Blessed Redeemer has so, *Rev.* 5. 9, 10. And so has the Father, *Phil.* 2. 9, 10, 11. and in the *Text* before us. And yet no Inferiority of Christ to the Father can thence be inferr'd, but what relates to his Office of Mediator, which I have already shewn, imports no Inferiority in respect of Nature and Essential Perfections. So that the Delivering up the Kingdom peculiarly to the Father does not make it plain, there is no God the Son in the same supreme Essence with the Father. And for Christ's Subjection, I have already suggested that it refers to his Human Nature. And our Author barely asserts without Proof, that God's being All in All, is to be appropriated to the Father, to the Exclusion of the Eternal Word and Holy Spirit. So that the Evidence our Author pretended to bring

us from this Text against our Saviour's Divinity is so far from being *irresistable*, that 'tis not so much as *discernable*. The Text evidently refers to *Christ's Mediatory Kingdom*, in the Administration whereof we freely own he bears a Character *Inferior* to that of the *Father*, but without any *Inequality* in the common Essential Properties of the Divine Nature.

The Author under this Head, (*viz. Of Christ's having a God above him*) proceeds to give us (as he pretends) the *Scriptural Account of the Godhead of the Blessed Jesus*, *viz. "Because he is invested with a God-like Authority and Power, from the supream God his Father. Thus (saith he) when he was accused by the captious Jews, for assuming the Character of the Son of God (which they perversly wou'd stretch, as if it imply'd an Equality with God) Joh. 10. 35, 36. He explains in what Sense only he justify'd it, viz. As one whom the Father had sanctified, i. e. called to a greater Office, and honour'd with a higher Commission than those Magistrates on whom the Scripture so freely bestows the Title of Gods.*

Answ. That our Author has perverted the true Scope of this Place, will appear if we impartially consider the whole Context. Our Lord Jesus at v. 28. argues the Security of his Sheep in his powerful Hand, *from which none cou'd pluck 'em*; and adds, that *his Father was greater than all, and that none cou'd pluck 'em out of the Father's Hands*, and then immediately subjoins, *I and the Father are One*, v. 30. Hereupon the Jews took up Stones to stone him as a *Blasphemer*, *because that he being a Man made himself God*. So that when he said, *I and the Father are One*, they apprehended the Meaning of Christ to be that they were *One in Nature*. Now 'tis evident, that our *Blessed Saviour* do's not disown this Sense they put on his Words, which he both shou'd and might most easily have done by telling 'em, He did not mean *One in Nature*, but *One in Design and Consent*; and indeed ought to have done for the Vindication of the incommunicable Glory of God, had

he been only a *Dignified Creature*. On the contrary, our Saviour argues from the Lesser to the Greater, that if *Magistrates were called Gods*, it cou'd be no *Blasphemy* for him, whom the *Father had sanctified and sent into the World*, to say, *That he was the Son of God*. But whom did he intend to represent himself to be by this Character of the *Son of God*? This he clearly intimates in the two following Verses, which our Author is pleas'd wholly to overlook, tho' 'tis manifest that they contain our Lord's Defence of the Expression that first offended the *Jews*. To justify his Character of the *Son of God*, he refers 'em to his *Works*, which were the apparent Effects of a Divine Almighty Power. *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, tho' ye believe not me, believe the Works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him, q. d.* Since my *Works* are the same as my *Father's*, this should convince you of the Truth of what I said, *That I and my Father are One, even One in Nature*; such Almighty Works being the genuine Productions of an Almighty Power that is both in the *Father*, and in *Me*. So that our *Lord* do's not lay the whole Stress of his being the *Son of God* upon his being *Sanctify'd and Sent*; those Expressions only contain the Description of his *Person* by his *Office*, but do not intimate the *Foundation* of his *Title*. For that our *Lord* evidently refers 'em to that truly *Divine and Almighty Power* that display'd it self in his *Works*. But this the Author thought it not convenient for his purpose to take notice of, tho' he might easily foresee it takes off the whole Force of his Argument, and establishes that very Account of the true *Deity* of *Christ* which we contend for.

The Author argues next from *Heb. i. 8, 9.* "*When he is there called God, 'tis explain'd in what Sense, or of what Sort of God. 'Tis to be understood by saying, That his God (intimating that he had a God over him) had anointed him with Oil, i. e. had invested him with Royal Power and Dignity (as Kings were install'd in Office by anointing 'em with Oil a-*
 mong

“mong the Jews). Which is an Explication of his
 “Godhead and Dominion. And this is said to be a-
 “bove his Fellows; not sure above the Father and Ho-
 “ly Spirit, (which only are pretended to be his Fellows
 “as God, by those who understand it of the supreme
 “Godhead) but above all other subordinate Beings.
 And he concludes, “This is one plain Scripture Ac-
 “count of his being called God. For these Things are
 “spoken to him, and of him, under the Character of
 “God. O God, thy Throne, v. 8. And he adds,
 “I think Men shou’d be well assur’d on what Grounds
 “they go, before they assign other Reasons of this Cha-
 “racter, so different from the Scripture Account.

Ans^r. To clear this Passage, I must refer the Rea-
 der to what was premis’d at p. 5. That our Lord Je-
 sus is a complex Subject, including (according to the
 common Faith of Christians) the *Eternal Word*, the
Human Nature, and the *Office of Mediator*. And
 therefore very different things may be spoken of
 him in reference to his two different Natures, and
 to his Office as Mediator.

Now the whole Strength of the *Author’s* Argu-
 ment turns upon this, That whatever is here said
 throughout the whole Chapter concerning our *Bles-
 sed Saviour*, is spoken of him in his *highest Capa-
 city and Character*. And therefore that when the in-
 spired Writer at v. 8. calls our *Saviour* God, he do’s
 at v. 9. assign the *Reason of his Godhead*, viz. be-
 cause he was by God his God anointed with the Oil of
Gladness above his Fellows. But these Suppositions on
 which our *Author’s* Argument is founded I deny;
 and need only have recourse to the Context for the
 Refutation of.

The Inspired Writer had at v. 2. describ’d our
Blessed Saviour as the *Son*, the *Heir* of all Things,
 and the *Maker of the Worlds*, or *Ages*. (Even the
 same *Ages* mention’d by the same Author, *Heb. 11.*
3. where they are evidently to be understood of the
World or Universe); and at v. 3. as the *Brightness of*
the Father’s Glory, and *express Image of his Person or*
Subsistence, and as *upholding all things by the Word of*

his Power. (And that these Expressions refer to his præ-existent and truly *Divine Nature*, any judicious Reader may be fully satisfy'd that will consult Dr. *Whitby's Paraphrase* on this Epistle ; for I must at present attend to the *Author's Argument*). At the end of v. 3. he takes notice of Christ's *Purging* (or expiating) our Sins (which was perform'd by his becoming in our Nature our *Sin-Offering* and *Propitiation*) and of his *Exaltation* thereupon at the right *Hand of the Majesty on high* (which imports the Dignity he was advanc'd to as *Mediator*). So that 'tis evident, That the inspir'd Writer speaks of our *Saviour* sometimes in reference to his *Præ-existent Nature*, sometimes in reference to his *Human*, sometimes in reference to his *Office and Dignity as Mediator*. But to descend to the Passage alledg'd, the inspir'd Writer in the following Verses produces several Instances of his Pre-eminence and Superiority to the *Angels* (the highest Rank of created Beings). He proves it from the Title of *Son*, being given him in a higher Sense than it was ever given to those noblest of Creatures, at v. 5. From the *Homage and Worship* due to him from the *Angels* themselves, at v. 6, 7. From the peculiar Title of *God* ascrib'd to him, and that on the Account of his *Essential Dominion and Kingdom*, at v. 8. *To the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* Which Words cannot be true of Christ's *Kingdom as Mediator*, which shall cease, and *be deliver'd up to the Father*. But of his Mediatory Kingdom he speaks at v. 9. where the Reason of it is assign'd, because *he loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity*, (i. e. because our Lord Jesus had in his humbled State perform'd a sinless Obedience to the Divine Laws in our Nature.) Therefore *God his God had anointed him with the Oil of Joy above his Fellows* ; i. e. had exalted him in that very Nature wherein he had perform'd that Obedience to a super-eminent Degree of *Glory and Joy* above all his Fellow-Creatures, above both *Men and Angels*. So that *God's* being called his *God* refers only to his *Human Nature*, to which the *Joy set before him*, as the
Reward

Reward of his Sufferings, did belong. (See *Hebr.* 12. 2.) And therefore this Expression do's not at all import any Superiority of the *Father* to the *Son* as to his *Divine Nature*. Nay, as to those who suppose (which yet I see no Necessity or Occasion for) that the *Father* is call'd *his God* in his *highest Capacity*, yet even this wou'd infer no more than the *Father's* being *above him* in respect to the *Order of Subsistence* between the *Sacred Three*, (on which Account the *Son* is call'd *God of God* in the ancient *Creeds*, as was observ'd before). But this wou'd argue no Inferiority of the *Son* to the *Father* in Point of *Essence*; and much less, That he was only call'd *God* on the Account of his *Office* and *Kingdom* as *Mediator*, or on the Account of his being a *Dignify'd Creature*. For that he was *God* in a much higher Sense is manifest from the very following Words, at *v.* 10, 11, &c. where the *Work of Creation* is ascrib'd to him, which plainly sets him above the Rank of *Creatures*, (as I shall anon more fully shew).

Since therefore the Author is mistaken in what he pretends to deliver as the *Scripture-Account of the God-head of the Blessed Jesus*, we may justly leave him to take his own Caution, (which he thinks himself qualify'd as *Dictator* to give to the Christian World), "*That Men shou'd be well assured on what Grounds they go in this Matter.*" We go on no less Grounds than the *Scripture's* giving him the most incommunicable *Titles of God*; applying manifold Passages of the *Old Testament* to him that are evidently spoken of the *Supreme God*, (particularly that from the 102d *Psal.* apply'd to our *Lord*, *Heb.* 1. 10.) ascribing truly *Divine Perfections and Worship* to him. (Of which more afterwards). Our *Author* goes upon *these two Passages*, which (as I have shewn) do *both* (consider'd in their reference to the Context) make against him.

The *Author* concludes this Head by endeavouring to prepossess his Reader against the Argument for the *true Deity of Christ* drawn from that noted Passage, *Phil.* 2. 6, &c. Of which he saith,

" *As*

“ As to that Place, Phil. 2. 6. which is corruptly
 “ render’d in our Translation, He thought it no Rob-
 “ bery to be Equal with God, It is confest by
 “ Adversaries themselves, that it shou’d be read thus,
 “ viz. That he did not assume, or arrogate, or snatch
 “ at, or covet, an Equality with God. The Words
 “ are never known to be us’d in any other Sense, as is
 “ shewn by Dr. Tillotson in his Sermons against the
 “ Socinians; also by Dr. Whitby in his Exposition
 “ on the Place, and others. So that this ra-
 “ ther denies than asserts Christ’s Equality to God, tho’
 “ still he was in the Form of God, as that notes the
 “ outward Resemblance of him in his mighty Power
 “ and Works, &c. which is the constant Meaning of
 “ Form in the New Testament.

Answ. On this Paragraph of the Author’s I have
 these three Reflections to make, which I am sorry
 he has given me too just occasion for.

1. That it looks like too great a Degree of
 Confidence to charge our Translation as corrupt in
 this place.

He knows well that the generality of Critics agree with us in this Version of the Words. And ’tis apparent to all that understand the Greek Language, that ἀπαιγμός signifies Robbery, and ἡγῆσθαι to Think or Judge. And what tho’ in Plutarch and Heliodorus the Phrase be us’d in a different Sense (which yet is less agreeable to the Primary Signification of the Words themselves) will it follow that the Apostle Paul used ’em in that Sense? Especially if we add that among all the Instances out of those Authors for this Sense of the Phrase, there is none that fully answers the Case before us. So that I see no cogent Reason for our receding from the most obvious Sense of the Words. And that plainly overturns the Author’s Sentiments. But,

2. I can scarce look upon it any better than a disingenuous Prevarication in our Author, to cite those two Excellent Writers (the late Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Whitby) as rejecting the common Translation of this Phrase, without giving us

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 43

a fair and just account of their *Exposition* of it. For he knows well enough that they give such an Interpretation of it, as equally asserts the *true Deity* of Christ with our own Translation. So that they are far from giving up this Place to the Unitarians, as our Author's Words would insinuate, to an unwary Reader. If with the Archbishop we suppose the *Form of God* to be an Expression parallel to those two opposite ones, the *Form of a Servant*, and the *Likeness of Men*, the former does as truly imply our Lord Jesus to be Partaker of a Divine Nature, as the latter implies him to be truly Partaker of the Human. And according to this Exposition, the Apostle might very well mention it as an Instance of our Blessed Saviour's admirable Humility, that he did not in his humbled State affect an Equality with God, but rather veil'd his Divine Glory in the mean disguise of our Sinful Flesh.

Nay, if we should take $\mu\omega\phi\eta$ to be meant of Outward Appearance or Resemblance (as our Author would understand it) He knows that Dr. Whitby has (according to that Sense of the Word) given us this clear Exposition of the Place, viz. That our Lord Jesus as the *Eternal Word*, did appear under the Old Testament with all the External Marks of Divine Majesty and Glory; but that at his Incarnation he did not affect to appear in this Likeness of God, but emptied himself, (i. e. divested himself of all this External Glory) and took on him the Form or Appearance of a Servant, (i. e. of one that came to minister, and not to be ministered unto, as our Lord himself seems to explain the Notion of a Servant, Matt. 20. 28.) being (for that purpose) made in the Likeness of Men. Accordingly the fore-mention'd Expositor, to confirm this Interpretation, shews, 1. That the Appearance or Likeness of God under the Old Testament was represented in a bright shining Cloud, or Light, or in a Flame of Fire, and in the Attendance of Angels. See Dan. 8. 9, 10. Exod. 24. 16, 17. Deut. 5. 22, 24. Heb. 3. 3, 4. &c. 2. That Christ as the *Eternal Word*, did appear in this Likeness to Moses and the Patriarchs

of

of old. This (he tells us) was the Opinion both of the Ancient *Jews* and of the Primitive *Christians*; and is clearly intimated in the Scriptures (as may appear particularly by comparing *Numb.* 21. 5, 6. with *1 Cor.* 10. 9.) where that *Jehovah* whom the *Israelites* are said to *Speak against* and *tempt*, is by the Apostle *Paul* affirm'd to have been *Christ*. See also *Heb.* 11. 26. 3. That after his *Ascension* our *Blessed Saviour* did re-assume this *Divine Form*, this *Majestick Splendor* and *Glory*. See *Acts* 7. 55. *Acts* 26. 13. *Rev.* 1. 14, 16. 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8.

Now this Exposition does evidently imply, That our *Blessed Saviour* had a *Præ-existent Nature* before he assum'd the Human, and that the *Præ-existent Nature* was *Divine*, both because that *External Glory*, and that attendance of *Angels*, was always reckon'd the peculiar *Mark* of the *Divine Presence*; and because *He* that thus appear'd under the *Old Testament*, is not only frequently stil'd *Jehovah*, but does every where lay claim to *Divine Perfections* and *Homage*.

So that tho' we shou'd read the Words, *who being* (before) *in the external Appearance* of *God*, did not affect a *Likeness* to *God*, &c. they do by no means favour either the *Arrian* or *Socinian Cause*, but clearly overthrow it.

3. I shall only add, That the *Author* has offer'd an Exposition of this Passage (borrow'd from the *Socinian Writers*) that is no way agreeable to the *Text* or *Context*.

By the *Form* of *God* he understands the *Outward Resemblance* of *Christ* to *God* in his mighty *Power* and *Works*: And so makes it an Argument of *Christ's Humility*, that tho' he appear'd like *God* in his *miraculous Works*, yet he did not pretend to an *Equality* with him.

Now this *Exposition* is liable to these following *Objections*.

1. That this *Power of Working Miracles* is nowhere in Scripture call'd the *Form* of *God*. Nay, according to this Exposition *Moses* and several *Prophets* under the *Old Testament*, and the *Apostles* under

der the *New*, might as truly be said to be in the *Form of God* as our *Blessed Saviour*, since they wrought *Miracles* as well as *He*.

2. Whatever be meant. by the *Form of God*, 'tis evident, that our *Lord Jesus* in his *humbled State* empty'd or *divested himself of it*, and in *Opposition* thereto, took on him the *Form of a Servant*. But *He* never in his *humbled State* *divested himself of the Power of Working Miracles*, but exerted it not only through the whole *Course of his Life*, but even at his *Apprehension* (a); nay, when *dying on the Cross*. For even then the *Sun was darkned, the Veil of the Temple rent in twain, the Earth quak'd, and the Rocks were rent, and the Graves open'd, and many Bodies of the Saints which slept arose*. See *Matt. 27. 45, 51, 52*. Infomuch as these *Effects of his Divine Power* forc'd that *Confession* from the *Centurion* and those with him, *Truly this was the Son of God*, v. 54.

3. The Text plainly intimates, That *Christ* was in the *Form of God* before he took on him the *Form of a Servant*, and was made in the *Likeness of Men*. Whereas he appear'd in the *Likeness of Men*, and convers'd among *Men*, many *Years* before he ever exerted his *Power of Working Miracles*. So that the *Apostle* shou'd have rather said according to this Exposition, That *Christ* having first taken on him the *Form of a Servant*, and being made in the *Likeness of Men*, did afterwards appear in the *Form or Likeness of God*, and yet did not snatch at, or arrogate to himself, an *Equality to him*. And whereas to avoid this Argument, the *Socinians* pretend, that by his taking on him the *Form of a Servant*, is to be understood his suffering the *Punishments and Death of a Slave*; the *Vanity of that Evasion* appears, both because suffering *Punishment* is in no tolerable Sense the *Form of a Servant*, but of a *Criminal*. For a *Man* may suffer it without being a *Servant* at all: And because *Christ's* taking on him the *Form of a*

(a) *John 18. 6. Luke 22. 51.*

Servant is conjoin'd with *his being made in the Likeness of Men*; and (to add no more) because *Christ's* suffering the common *Death of Slaves* is added by the *Apostle* as a further degree of his *Humiliation*, after he was found in the fashion or habit of a *Man*, at v. 8. And being found in fashion as a *Man*, he became obedient unto *Death*, even the *Death of the Cross*. This is evidently a distinct *Step or Degree* of his *Humiliation* from that of his taking on him the *Form of a Servant*, and being made in the *Likeness of Men*.

Once more,

4. This Exposition greatly weakens the force of the *Apostle's* Argument for *Lowliness of Mind*, from the *Example of Christ's* Marvellous *Humility and Condescension*.

The *Apostle*, according to the *Author*, makes it an Argument of *Extraordinary Humility* in our *Blessed Saviour*, that when he was like *God in working Miracles*, yet he did not arrogate to himself an *Equality with God*. But where is the *Humility*, that a mere *Man*, (who according to him cou'd work no *Miracle* by any Power of his own) shou'd not affect an *Equality* to his *Eternal and Almighty Maker*, between whom and him there is an *Infinite* distance and disproportion? Is not this as if we shou'd commend the *Humility* of the *Lord Mayor of Dublin*, because he never aspir'd to the *Imperial Crown of these three Kingdoms*? Is it so rare an Instance of *Lowliness of Mind*, that a *Man* shou'd abstain from the highest degree possible of *stupid Blasphemy*? Let us apply this to the *Apostles*. Our *Lord* foretold 'em, *That they shou'd do greater Works than his*, *John* 14. 12. So that according to our *Author's* Exposition, *They* were as truly in the *Form of God* as our *Saviour* himself, (if that must be understood of the *Power of Working Miracles*). Nay, if *Christ* be only a *Creature*, they no more derive that Power from him than he from them, but both from the *Father*. Now what shou'd we think of the *Apostle Paul*, who himself shar'd in this *Power*, if he had propos'd this as a marvellous Instance of his own and *Barnabas's* *Humility*, that
when

when the *Lycaonians* cry'd out, *The Gods are come down to us in the Likeness of Men*, and accordingly actually offer'd to pay 'em Divine Worship, they refus'd it, and did not pretend to an *Equality with God*? Shou'd we think this any such extraordinary Instance of *Lowliness of Mind*? Is there any great need of proposing such an Example to our Imitation, when no Man in his Wits seems capable of such monstrous Arrogance?

But now according to the last Exposition given of the Words, the Argument drawn from the Example of our Lord is most cogent and strong, viz. that he the *Eternal Word*, who had always before appear'd with the Marks of *Divine Majesty and Glory*, did not now affect such a *Likeness to God*, but stript himself (of all that *Glory*) to take on him the (contemptible) *Form of a Servant*, and to be made in the *Likeness of Men*. This is an Instance both of most astonishing *Condescension* and *Humility*, and of a truly *Divine Charity*; that the Lord of *Glory* shou'd for our sakes stoop so low, and appear in so mean a disguise. 'Tis such an unparallell'd Instance of it as may at once command our *highest Wonder*, and our most *zealous Imitation*.

Upon the whole it appears, that whether way we translate those Words [*He thought it no Robbery to be Equal with God*] or [*He affected not a Likeness to God*] the Text stands as a firm unshaken Proof of the *True Deity of our Blessed Saviour*.

Having vindicated this Argument from the *Divine Titles* given to our *Blessed Saviour*, from the *Author's* Objections, I might here inforce it from the other Head of *Divine Worship*; but that Argument will appear with better Advantage, when we have consider'd, that the peculiar *Perfections* and *Works* of God (the true Foundation of *Divine Worship*) are ascrib'd to him.

I come therefore to the

Second Argument for the *Deity of Christ*, from the *Incommunicable Attributes* and *Works* of God that are in the Holy Scriptures ascrib'd to him.

I join both these together, because the Incommunicable *Works of God* plainly demonstrate such *Divine Perfections* to belong to him by whom they are perform'd.

As to these *Divine Perfections* or *Attributes* the *Author* tells us, "That our Blessed Lord Jesus dis-claims those infinite Perfections that belong only to the Supreme God of Gods. And adds, 'Tis most certain, that if he want one, or any of these Perfections that are essential to the Deity, He is not God in the chief Sense; and if we find him dis-claiming the one, he cannot challenge the other, &c.

Answ. We willingly put the Controversie on this issue, and freely grant that he cannot be the Supreme God, to whom the infinite Perfections essential to the Deity do not belong. Tho' as to what the *Author* suggests, That if he want any one of 'em, he is not the Supreme God; we may with equal Reason infer on the other hand, that if it be proved he has any one infinite Perfection that belongs to the Deity, it will prove his being the Supreme God. For all *Divine Perfections* as they are infinite, are alike incommunicable to any other Being.

The *Author* fixes on those three Perfections of *Absolute Omnipotence*, *Absolute Goodness*, and *Absolute Omniscience*.

I observe, that he has omitted that Perfection of *Eternity* that first offers it self to one's View and Consideration. 'Tis probable he was willing to avoid that Controversie between those *Unitarians* that espouse the *Arrian*, and those that follow the *Socinian* Scheme about our *Saviour's Præ-existence*. For I imagine the *Author* himself thinks the *Socinian* Doctrine in this Point *indefensible*, and therefore seems to allow of a *Præ-existent Nature* in our *Blessed Lord*, at p. 2. And he is not the only Writer among the late *Unitarians* that allows (what they call) an *ante-mundane Existence* of our *Blessed Saviour*. But since he has offer'd nothing to implead his *Eternity*, I shall refer the Reader to the Arguments alledg'd for it by those that have wrote on this

this Controversie, and shall only add, that the *Psalmist* knew of no other Being that existed before the World but God, when he thus describes his *Eternity*, *Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the Earth, thou art from everlasting to everlasting God*, Psal. 90. 2.

I shall therefore confine my self to these three *Perfections*, which the Author pretends that our Lord *Jesus* disclaims. I begin,

I. With that of *absolute and underiv'd Omnipotence*; which (as the Author tells us) "*is one great and peculiar Perfection of the Deity. He who can not work all Miracles, and do what he list of himself, without help from another, can never be the Supreme God, &c.*"

Now in treating on this branch of the Argument, I shall

First *Prove*, That the Scriptures do ascribe such *absolute Omnipotence* to our *Blessed Lord*; and, Secondly, *Examine* what the Author has alledg'd to shew, that our *Blessed Saviour* disclaims it.

First, I shall *Prove*, That the Scriptures do ascribe this *absolute Omnipotence* to our Lord *Jesus*, or do attribute that *Almighty Power* to him that is the *incommunicable Perfection* of the *Deity*.

And because the *Power of Causes* does best appear by the *Greatness* of their *Effects*, I shall chiefly insist on this one *Argument* (among many others which the Scriptures suggest) which I take to be both clear and conclusive in this matter, I mean that drawn from the *Creation of the World*. And to make it good, I shall,

I. *Prove*, That the Holy Scriptures do ascribe to our *Blessed Lord* the *Creation of the World*, in the usual Sense, i. e. The Giving Being to all the several Creatures contain'd in it.

II. That this *Creation of the World* argues the *Almighty Power* of him that made it; and consequently is (according to our Author's Concession) a solid Proof of his true *Deity*.

Under the former of these Heads I have the *Socinian Unitarians*, under the latter the *Arrian ones*, to oppose.

E

I. I

1. I come to shew, *That the Holy Scriptures do ascribe to our Blessed Lord the Creation of the World, in the common Sense of the Words, i. e. That he gave Being to all the several Creatures contained in it.*

Let us, to clear this matter, take a gross view of those Passages that assert this, and then more narrowly examine the force of 'em.

Moses begins his History of the Creation with these Words, In the beginning God made the Heavens and the Earth, Gen. 1. 1.

St. John begins his Gospel with these parallel ones, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made. And again at v. 10. The World was made by him.

And that *St. John* by all things that were made by him, intends all things in Heaven and Earth, mention'd in the Mosaic account of the Creation, is evident if we will allow his Sentiments to have been the same with *St. Paul's*, who tells us, *That by him all things were Created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, Col. 1. 16.* And because *Angels* are not mention'd in the Mosaic Account of the Creation, least any shou'd think them excluded (as some actually did, and even ascrib'd the Mosaic Creation to 'em) the Apostle adds *all things Visible and Invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* And the same inspired Writer (if we suppose *St. Paul* the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) tells us, *That by him (viz. his Son) God made the Worlds, even those Worlds which, as he tells us in the same Epistle, we understand by Faith that they were framed by the Word of God.* Compare *Heb. 1. 2.* with *c. 11. 3.* And to put it, as far as Words can do, beyond any reasonable Dispute, the same inspired Writer at v. 10, 11, 12. of the first

Chap-

Chapter applies to our *Blessed Saviour* these remarkable Words of the *Psalmist* which so manifestly refer to the *first Creation*, *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as a Garment, and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy Years fail not.*

Now it is manifest, That we are so far from offering the least Violence to these Passages, that we understand 'em according to the plain obvious Sense of the Words, and their current Use and Signification thro' the Scriptures, from which none ought to recede in expounding 'em, without cogent Necessity. They clearly and fully deliver our Opinion, and we have no occasion to strain 'em to reconcile 'em with our Sentiments concerning our *Blessed Lord*.

But we cannot say so concerning our Adversaries in this point, the *Socinian Unitarians*, who are reduc'd to hard shifts to reconcile these Passages that ascribe the *Creation of all things in Heaven and Earth* to our Lord *Jesus*, to their Opinion of him, *That he had no Existence at all till about 4000 Years after the making of the World.*

I must therefore consider what they have alledg'd to avoid the force of these Texts.

And I find 'em chiefly insisting on the two following Evasions.

I. They do as to all the fore-mention'd Texts (except that *Heb. i. 10, &c.*) alledge, that they are not to be understood of the *Creation of this material World*, but only of that *Reformation of Mankind*, of that *happy change of the Moral State and Condition of the World*, which they tell us the Scriptures often express under the Notion of a *New Creation*, and *the making New Heavens and New Earth*.

Now against this way of Expounding these fore-cited Passages, I have these following Arguments to offer.

I. It has been often objected to 'em, That *this Exposition is wholly new*. All Christian Writers for 1500 Years agreeing (the *Arrians* themselves not excepted) to understand these Passages as we do of the *First Creation*. So that if the general Consent of the Christian Church in expounding these Texts be of any Weight, this Argument from *Authority* is full against 'em. But because this Argument seems to weigh but little with any of our late *Unitarians*, who on all Occasions treat the *Christian Church* with the utmost Contempt, I shall insist on such as are drawn from the Passages themselves :

Therefore,

II. 'Tis a just Prejudice against this Exposition, that it puts a very *unusual* and *forced Sense* upon *plain* and *clear Expressions* without any *cogent Necessity*.

To make this good, I shall present to the Reader the fore-cited *Passages*, with the *Paraphrase* of our late *Unitarians* upon 'em.

For that *John* 1. 1, 2, 3, 10. I find it thus expounded in the 3^d Collection of *Unitarian Tracts*. *Tract* 1. p. 9. " *In the Beginning of the Gospel was the Word,*
 " *that is, The Lord Christ, who being the Bringer or*
 " *Messenger of God's Will or Word, is therefore call'd*
 " *the Word, as in this very Chapter he is call'd Life*
 " *and Light, because he brought to Men the Gospel*
 " *Light, and the Means of Life Eternal. And the*
 " *Word was with God, i. e. the Lord Christ was ta-*
 " *ken up into Heaven to be instructed in all Points re-*
 " *lating to his Embassy or Ministry. And the Word*
 " *was God. In Greek 'tis, was a God. That is, It*
 " *pleased God to communicate to the Lord Christ, who is*
 " *the Mediator or Bringer of the New Testament, that*
 " *Name above every Name, even the Name or Appel-*
 " *lation of God ; as he had formerly done to Moses the*
 " *Mediator of the Old Testament ; and to divers others,*
 " *Exod. 7. 1. Psal. 45. 6, 11. and Psal. 82. 6. John*
 " *10. 34, 35. 1 Sam. 28. 11, 12, 13, 14. By him*
 " *were all things made, that is, All things relating to*
 " *the New-Creation were made (or were effected) by*
 " *him.*

“ *him.* The World was made by him, in the Greek,
 “ was modell’d by him, i. e. He reduc’d all
 “ things to a new and better Estate; by his abolishing
 “ Paganism and Judaism, and introducing the Gospel
 “ Oeconomy and State.

For Col. 1. 16, &c. I find it thus paraphras’d,
 1st Collect. of Unitarian Tracts. Tract, 12th, p. 16.

“ *Christ is the Lord of every Creature; for by him*
 “ *are all, both visible and invisible Creatures, even all*
 “ *Men and Angels, modell’d and dispos’d into a new*
 “ *Order, being subjected to him and his Commands. As*
 “ *for Angels; all the Orders of ’em, whether they be*
 “ *Thrones or Dominions, none of ’em are exempted*
 “ *from his Power and Authority. He rules over ’em,*
 “ *(Which is the Meaning of v. 17.) And they are all*
 “ *as it were compacted into one Body under his Conduct.*
 “ *As for Men, as he is the Beginning and First-born*
 “ *from the Dead, so he was also made Head of his*
 “ *Church his Body. So that in all things he has the*
 “ *Pre-eminence: He rules in Heaven and Earth over*
 “ *Angels, and over the Church, which is the Sense of*
 “ *v. 18.*

For that Text, Heb. 1. 2. *By whom also he made the*
Worlds, they understand by *Worlds,* the Gospel Ages
 or Times.

For Heb. 1. 10, 11, &c. they generally assert that
 ’tis not apply’d to *Christ* at all, or at most only one
 Clause in the Text, about the material World’s
 perishing and being chang’d.

As to all these *Expositions,* I may justly appeal to the
 common Sense of every Christian Reader, whether
 they do not at first View appear *strain’d* and *forc’d,*
 and many of ’em far fetch’d. ’Tis manifest that the
 Words in their most obvious Sense are to be under-
 stood of the *First Creation.* Now this the *Socinian*
Unitarians suppose to be a very dangerous Error.
 And yet ’tis evident that the inspired Writers might
 have easily prevented this Error which their Expres-
 sions so naturally lead us to, by saying, All things
 were made new by Christ, All things were created by
 him anew in Heaven and Earth. Or were new-modell’d

by him. That by him God made the *New-Age* and Dispensation of the Gospel. And 'tis evident, That where the inspired Writers do speak of the Change made in the Hearts of Men by *Regeneration*, in Allusion to the Work of *Creation*, they do use such cautious Expressions as these, which plainly point us to this Metaphorical Sense. Whereas according to these, the inspired Writers, in the Passages under our Consideration, have needlessly affected to speak in ambiguous Language, so very liable to be misunderstood, that without an harsh and forced Exposition, it must needs mis-lead and pervert the Judgment of their Readers in a Matter of the highest Consequence. And none can well suppose this of 'em, that believes they wrote by Divine Inspiration.

It had been objected to 'em by the late *Archbishop of Canterbury*, That a Man might with the same Dexterity of Wit and Fancy pervert the Words of *Moses* that speak of the *First Creation*, and interpret 'em of the *Moral Change made in the World by the Mosaic Dispensation*, as they do the Words of *St. John* in the Beginning of his Gospel. And 'tis observable what our late *Unitarians* reply to it. 'Tis this, "That
 " if it had been said in *Genesis*, In the Beginning
 " *Moses* created the Heavens and the Earth, &c.
 " they wou'd have thought themselves oblig'd to interpret that Chapter of the *Moral Change made in the*
 " *World by the Mosaic Dispensation*. And they think
 " themselves equally oblig'd to interpret the Beginning
 " of *St. John's Gospel* this way, because they find the
 " *Evangelist* speaking of the Lord Christ, who is confessed to have been a Man, and yet saith of him,
 " All things were made by him. And again, The
 " World was made by him. Hereupon the *Socinians*
 " think it wild Extravagance to imagine more Gods
 " or New-Creators, &c. See 3d Collect. Tract. I.
 " p. 47.

Ans. Can any thing be a more notorious begging the Question than this? They are ask'd, Why we may not interpret the 1st of *Genesis*, as they do the first of *St.*

St. John ? The Sum of the *Answer* is, because in *Genesis* the *Creation* there mention'd is ascrib'd to God, and not to Moses, whereas in St. John 'tis ascribed to one confessed to be a Man. Is it so ? Is it evident that the Evangelist by the *Word* that was with God, and was God, that was the *Light* that lighteth every Man that comes into the *World*, &c. understands only a Man ? Do not his Words rather in their most obvious Sense describe a higher Being ? Do's he not expressly call him God ? Does he not tell us afterwards at v. 14. that *this Word* was made *Flesh*, and dwelt among us, &c. and thereby plainly distinguish the *Word* from that frail and mortal *Human Nature* he assum'd in order to his Converse with the Sons of Men ? So that there is nothing here that shou'd force 'em to put this unusual and harsh Construction upon the plain Words of the Evangelist, but a violent Passion for their pre-conceiv'd Opinion, *That Jesus Christ is only a Man*, and that he is only call'd the *Word* because he was the *Bringer of the Will and Word of God*, in which Sense every Prophet might assume the same Title and Character to himself, which the Scriptures elsewhere appropriate to the Son of God as his Peculiar and most Illustrious Character, and speak of it as *A Name that none knew but he himself*, Rev. 19. 12, 13. But I must add,

III. Their Exposition is *inconsistent* with the *genuine Sense* of these *Passages of Scripture*.

To clear this I shall make a few Remarks upon their *Exposition* of each of these *Passages*.

As to the *Exposition* they give of *John* 1. 1, 2, 3, 10. (mention'd p. 52.) I might take notice, how strange a Construction they give of those Words, *was with God*, when they expound 'em of *Christ's* being taken up into *Heaven* to be instructed in his *Embassage and Ministry*. For they are forc'd for the perverting 'em to invent a Matter of Fact, which there is no Footstep of in the whole History of our Saviour's Life ; tho' had it been true, it was of the greatest Importance, and a particular Relation of it highly needful to confirm our Belief of his Divine

Mission. I might also observe, That that *Author* supposes the *Name or Appellation of God* here given to *Christ* to be the *Name above every Name* (mention'd by the Apostle, *Phil. 2. 9, 10.*) and yet makes that *Name* to be *common to him with Moses, and Solomon, with Angels and Magistrates*, which looks very like a Contradiction. And he most untruly insinuates that *Moses* is call'd a *God*, as he was *Mediator of the Old Testament*. Whereas he is only call'd a *God to Pharaoh, Exod. 7. 1.* But against his *Exposition*, That all things being made by *Christ*, means only, *All things relating to the New Creation were made or effected by him*: And that the *World's being made by him*, imports only, *Its being modell'd and reduc'd to a better State, &c.* I have these three Things to offer.

1. 'Tis false in Matter of Fact, That all things relating to the *New-Creation* were done by him.

All the *Predictions* of the *Old Testament*, the whole of *John the Baptist's Ministry*, all the *Labours of the Apostles* in propagating the Gospel; nay, our Lord's own miraculous Conception, Resurrection, &c. relate to the *New-Creation*, and yet can in no tolerable Sense be said to be done or effected by the Man *Christ Jesus*.

2. That *World was made by him in which he was. He was in the World, and the World was made by him.* But he was in this material *World*, and therefore the *Creation of that* is ascrib'd to him.

3. That the Evangelist speaks not of his making the *Spiritual World*, appears by the following Words, *The World was made by him, and the World knew him not.* Even that *World* that was made by him knew him not. Which cannot be true of the *Spiritual World, i. e.* of that part of Mankind whom our Saviour has made *New-Creatures*, and has reform'd; for those *knew* and readily own'd him. To avoid this, they are forc'd to suppose that the Evangelist, in the Compass of one Verse, uses the *World* in three different Senses, and two of 'em directly opposite to one another. For when the Evangelist saith,

saith, *Christ was in the World*, they understand it of this *material World*. When he adds, *The World was made by him*, they understand it of that part of *Mankind that embrac'd the Gospel, and were reform'd by it*. When he adds, *that the World knew him not*, they understand it of that part of *Mankind that continued Infidel and Unreform'd*. But who can ever think that an inspir'd Writer wou'd use such strange Ambiguity as this in a plain and simple Narrative? Especially when such ambiguous Expressions were in so great Danger of being misunderstood, and have actually led the whole Christian Church to believe that the Evangelist asserted Christ to be the Maker of the World, which our Adversaries take to be a pernicious Error? Can they reverence him as an inspired Writer, who thus incautiously plays with an ambiguous Word to the extreme Peril of his Reader?

For their *Exposition* of Col. 1. 16, &c. I need only run briefly over it to expose the Absurdity of it.

The Apostle saith, *By Christ were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in Earth*. Cou'd he have us'd any Expressions more full and comprehensive than these? Or any more frequently us'd to express *all the Creatures contain'd in the World*? Nay, things *Invisible* as well as *Visible* were created by him. Even *Thrones and Dominions, Principalities and Powers*.

All things visible were created by him, i. e. say they, "The degenerate state of Mankind was reform'd, "Paganism and Judaism abolish'd, and the Gospel "Oeconomy introduc'd. But where can they find all things visible, and all things on Earth, us'd in Scripture for that part of Mankind which was reform'd by the Preaching of the Gospel? We read indeed of the things that are seen, and which were not made of things that do appear, Heb. 11. 3. But those are meant of this Visible Creation. And we read of all things that are on Earth frequently mention'd as part of the first Creation. But these Phrases are never
us'd

us'd to represent those that renounc'd Judaism and Paganism, and embrac'd Christianity ; And yet these are the only, *All things visible, and all things on Earth*, that our Adversaries will allow Christ to have *created*. For they cannot suppose that the Apostle understands so much as Mankind in general, since it was but a very small part of it that embrac'd the Gospel. So that he shou'd in all reason have only said, *some things visible, and some things on Earth, were created by him*. Besides, the Apostle treats of this *New-Creation* as a distinct thing afterwards at v. 20, 21, &c. But did he thus also create all things *Invisible, Thrones and Dominions, &c* ? Did he reform the *Holy Angels* from a state of degeneracy, that never fell into it ? Or restore them to the Image and Favour of God, who never fell from it ? No. Here his *Creating* does not import any such *New-Creation* at all ; For there was no need of it. What does it import then ? Why they tell us, *That the Holy Angels were modell'd and dispos'd by him, i. e.* They were subjected to his Authority. But (besides the manifest harshness of this Paraphrase) how comes the Apostle to say, *That the Holy Angels were thus modell'd by Christ* ? Did he thus subject 'em to himself ? No, this was none of his *Act* at all, but only the *Act of the Father*, and it was by him alone that they were thus modell'd. For 'tis he that put 'em under his Feet, 1 Cor. 15, 28. Besides, Cou'd the Apostle find no fitter way to express the *Holy Angels being subjected by the Father to Christ*, but by saying, *they were created by Christ himself* ? (For that is the most plain and usual sense of the word.) This Inferior World was at first *subjected by God to the Dominion of Man*. But what shou'd we have thought of *Moses*, if in his History of the *Creation* he had told us, *That all things both in Earth and Sea were created by Man* ? Cou'd we ever imagine that he meant no more, than that God when he made 'em put 'em under his Authority. But what shall we say of *Evil Angels* ? (For they are also call'd *Principalities and Powers*) Why, they are said to be *created by Christ*, be-

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 99

because he rules over 'em with a design to *destroy their usurped Dominion and Power*. So that the same Word, apply'd to *Mankind*, implies *Reforming 'em*, to good Angels *Commanding 'em*, to fallen Angels it signifies *destroying their usurped Power*. But upon the whole, his *Creating all things* comes at last (as the *Bishop of Worcester* had well observ'd) to his *Creating nothing at all*. To such strange Inconsistencies are our Adversaries reduc'd by their bold Attempts to wrest such passages as these from their clear obvious meaning.

For that passage, *Heb. 1. 2. By whom he also made the Worlds*, That it is not meant of the *Gospel-Ages or Times*, will appear if we consider, That no place in all the Scripture can be produc'd in which ^{always} is to be understood of the *Gospel-times or Ages*, where 'tis evidently us'd by the *Inspired Writer* of this Epistle, for the *World or Universe*. *Heb. 11. 3. By Faith we understand that the Worlds were made by the Word of God*. Even by that *Word or Son of God, by whom*, he is said in this place, *to make 'em*.

Again, If the *Inspired Writer* had meant the *Gospel-times*, he shou'd not have said that God *has made 'em by his Son*, but that he *is now about to make 'em*. For they were far from being then made. And for those that understand by *the Worlds*, the *World or Ages to come*, i. e. the *Heavenly Regions* and the *Happiness* thereof; They are reduc'd to the necessity of giving us a yet harsher Exposition of the words, when they tell us, That tho' the *World* in that sense be not properly *made by Christ*, (For those heavenly Regions they suppose to be made long before he had a Being) yet he is said to *make 'em*, because he *made 'em ours*, by giving us the Promises of that future Happiness. And what plain Text may not any Man pervert, at that wild and loose rate of Interpreting?

But I must add,

IV. There is one of these Texts which undeniably refers to the *Old Creation*, and cannot be understood of the *Reformation of Mankind by the Gospel*.

To

A VINDICATION of the

To clear this, We must observe That the Inspired Writer to the *Hebrews* saith at v. 8, 9. *To the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.* and immediately subjoins at v. 10. *And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of this Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands; They shall perish, but thou remainest. And they shall all wax old as doth a Garment. And as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; But thou art the same, and thy Years shall not fail.*

Here indeed our Adversaries skill in Critics fails 'em, and all the Subtilty they are Masters of will not enable 'em to pervert this Passage, as they do the rest, to speak only of the *New Creation*. For they plainly see, the *Heavens and Earth* here spoken of, *shall perish*. Whereas the *New Creation* shall be perfected, not *destroy'd*, shall *last for ever*, not *perish* or *be changed*. And therefore under this strait they are forc'd to a very desperate shift, even to deny, *That the Inspired Writer intended to apply these words to our Blessed Saviour*. But how can that be? Does he not as truly apply this passage taken out of *Psalms* 102 to our Saviour, as that taken out of the 45th? Nay, if these words refer not to our *Lord Jesus*, to what purpose are they alledg'd? What do they signifie to prove his Pre-eminence above those *Angels* that are requir'd to *worship him*; and indeed are under the highest Obligations to do it, if he gave 'em their Being? Nay, why should we scruple to apply to him the *Creation of the Heavens and the Earth* at v. 10. to whom the Inspired Writer had ascrib'd the *Making of the Worlds* at v. 2? All the Business is, That they cou'd more easily pervert those words at v. 2. by interpreting 'em of a *Metaphorical Creation*, than they can those at v. 10. But rather than own Christ as the Maker of this material World, they seem not concern'd what Indignity they put on the Inspired Writer, by making him cite this passage (according to them) to no *valuable purpose*, nay, rather to a very ill and dangerous one, that

that naturally leads us to what they account a pernicious *Error*.

But because this looks too gross, some of 'em seem willing to grant, That the *Inspired Writer* did design in citing this passage out of *Psalms* 102, to apply by way of accommodation that passage in it to our Lord Jesus, that speaks of the perishing of the old Creation. For they tell us the Destruction of this visible World belongs to Christ, tho' the Creation of it does not. But we are sure, To whom the Psalmist saith, *they shall perish, but thou remainest, To him* he had said before, *Thou, Lord, hast founded the Earth, &c.* And we are sure the *Inspired Writer* makes no change of the Person, so that if the latter Clause of this Quotation belong to Christ, so does the former.

And for their Objection against our applying this passage to Christ, viz. That if the Author had believed Christ to be the *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, what need he take so much pains to prove his Superiority to *Angels*, For who doubts of the Creator being Superior to his *Creatures*? It will appear to have no weight in it, if we consider, That the Apostle had undertaken to shew, not only the *Dignity of Christ*, as *Heir of all things*, but that he was therefore the *Heir and Lord of all things*, because *they were made by him*. And for this purpose it was proper to cite such passages of the *Old Testament* as attribute the first Creation to him. And this was the more needful, because there were both some *Jews* and *Hereticks* that ascrib'd the first Creation to *Angels*; in opposition to whom the *Inspired Writer* had just occasion to ascribe it to our *Blessed Lord*; which he does by citing this Passage out of a *Psalms*, which the ancient *Jews* had apply'd to the *Messiah* (a).

Having shewn the Vanity of this their most specious *Evasion*, I need not insist long on their

(a) See *The Judgment of the Jewish Church*, &c. p. 38.

Ill Evasion, viz. That tho' it should be allow'd, that these Passages speak properly of the *first Creation of the World*, yet they do not assert, That the *World was made by Christ*, but only *for him*, (*i. e.*) with a design to subject it to him. For so they render the words *δι' αὐτοῦ* *John* 1. 3, and 10. And so *Heb.* 1. 2.

But the unreasonableness of this Pretence will appear, if we consider,

1. That this sense is no way agreeable to the Original. For if the Apostle had intended to have said, *All things were made for him*, he should have said *δι' αὐτόν*.

2. This sense is evidently confuted by the words of the Apostle, *Col.* 1. 16. where these *Two* are carefully distinguish'd, and both apply'd to our *Blessed Saviour*. *That all things were made both by him, and for him*, *δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*. Nay, he is therefore said to be the *First-born of the Creation* in the verse foregoing, and to be *before all things* in the verse following (which latter Phrase best explains the Sense of the former) because *all things were made by him*. Whereas it wou'd not prove, That he is *before all things*, because they were created *for him* (*i. e.* with a design to subject 'em to him) long before he had a Being. And to avoid this, I find one of the *Unitarian* Writers straining his Critical Skill, by thus Paraphrasing the Words, *All things were made for him, and to his Service, and he is above all things*. (For so he groundlessly renders *πρὸ πάντων*). (b) But he is hard put to it, when he is forc'd to make the Inspired Apostle guilty of so gross a *Tautology*, as to say, *All things were made for him, and for him*: For so *εἰς αὐτόν* undoubtedly signifies, (see *Rom.* 11. 36.) tho' he falsely pretends that *δι' αὐτοῦ* signifies so too. And I may by the way add, that we are sure from the Text just now cited, *Rom.* 11. 36. that all things are only *for or to him*, *Of whom*, and *by* (or

(b) See *Third Collection of Tracts*. Tract I. p. 52.

thro') whom they are. So that if all things be for or to Christ, 'tis because he is that God of and by whom they are. And if the Unitarians make the Apostle guilty of this *Tautology* here, they must suppose him to be guilty of it there too, for the Phrases are evidently the same in both Texts. But there no Man will pretend that *ὁ ἀὐτός* and *ἐκ αὐτοῦ* signifies the same thing.

I shall only add,

3. That the forecited Text, *Heb. 1. 10.* is no way capable of this *Evasion*. All things must be made by as well as for him, who founded the Earth, and the Work of whose Hands the Heavens are.

Having prov'd against the Socinian Unitarians, that the Scriptures ascribe the Creation of the World to Christ, in the proper sense, I now proceed,

II. To prove, in opposition to the Arian Unitarians, That the Creation of the Word is a solid Evidence of the Almighty Power of him that made it, and (consequently) of his true Deity.

These Adversaries do indeed fairly allow us the plain literal sense of the foremention'd Passages that ascribe the Creation of all things to our Blessed Saviour: But they deny this Inference we draw from it. For they tell us, Our Lord had a *præ-existent Nature*; That in respect of that Nature he was the first and most perfect Being that ever God made, and employ'd by him as his Instrument in the Creation of the World. And this they suppose he might be, without ascribing Omnipotence to him. Nay, they pretend this their Opinion to be countenanc'd by the Apostle, when he calls our Lord *The First-born of every Creature*, *Col. 1. 15.* and by Christ, when he styles himself *the beginning of the Creation of God*, *Rev. 3. 14.*

Now to justify the Assertion I have laid down in opposition to these Adversaries, I shall offer the following Considerations.

1. The Scriptures every where appropriate the Works of Creation to God, and exclude all other Beings whatever from the glory of it.

The

The *Author to the Hebrews* lays down this as a granted Maxim, *Every House is built by some Man, but he that built all things is God*, Heb. 3. 4. And accordingly throughout the whole Old Testament the great God does every where distinguish himself from all other pretended Deities by this, *That he was the Maker of Heaven and Earth*; He every where challenges this as his peculiar Glory, *That they, and all things contain'd in 'em, are the Work of his Hands. 'Tis one God that Created 'em*, Mal. 2. 10. *As for those Gods that have not created the Heavens and the Earth*, he declares, *that they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens. But he is the true God, that hath made the Earth by his Power, and establish'd the World by his Wisdom*, Jer. 10. 10, 11, 12.

Nay, he positively excludes any other Being from any share in the glory of this illustrious Work. *Thou, (saith Hezekiah) even thou alone, art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth; thou hast made Heaven and Earth*, 2 Kings 19. 15. To the same purpose *Nebemiah* saith, *Thou, even thou, art Lord alone, thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Hosts, (those Thrones and Dominions, Principalities and Powers, said to be created by Christ, Col. 1. 16.) the Earth, and all things that are therein, the Seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest 'em all. (Compare this with Col. 1. 17. by him all things consist, and Heb. 1. 3. He upholds all things by the word of his Power.) And the Host of Heaven worship thee. (Compare this with Heb. 1. 6. Let all the Angels of God worship him.) He alone (saith Job, speaking of God) spreads out the Heavens*, Job 9. 8. Nay, the *Blessed God* himself saith, *I have made the Earth, and created Man upon it. I, even my Hands, (i. e. my Power) have stretched out the Heavens, and all their Host have I commanded*, Is. 45. 12. And sure if any Expressions can be decisive in this matter, God's own words must be allow'd to be so, when he so positively declares by the Prophet, *I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, and spreadeth abroad the Earth by*
my

my self, *Is. 44. 24.* How unaccountable and unwarrantable are these Expressions if the great God us'd another, even a *Created Being*, as his *Minister* and *Instrument* in the great Work of *Creation*? For none is said to do that *alone* and *by himself* which he uses the *assistance* and *ministry* of another in the performance of. Nay, how inexcusable is the *Inspired Writer* to the *Hebrews*, that ascribes this Work of *Creation* to *Christ* in the same Expressions which the *Psalmist* had us'd concerning the great *Jehovah*, *Thou hast founded the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands!* *Heb. 1. 10.*

But if we allow our Lord Jesus to be the same God with the Father, 'tis no way inconsistent with God's making all things by himself, that the *Father* made 'em by his *Son*, his *Eternal Essential Word*. For even the same *Inspired Writers* declare that God made 'em by his *Word*, and by the *Breath of his Mouth*, *Psal. 33. 6.* The *Essential Power* of the *Father* and the *Son* are the same. But that leads me to add,

2. The Apostle *Paul* makes the *Creation of the World* a demonstrative proof of his *Eternal Power* and *Godhead* that made it.

For the *Invisible things of him* (saith he) from the *Creation of the World* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his *Eternal Power* and *Godhead*, *Rom. 1. 20.* But now the Force of this Argument is lost, if a *Being* might make all those things that had no such *Eternal Power* and *Godhead* at all, but was it self a created and temporary Being, and the voluntary Production of a superior Being.

3. The very Notion of an *Instrument* in the Work of *Creation* seems absurd and inconsistent.

For God's *Creation of the World* is all along express'd in Scripture by his *Commanding things into Being*. Thus in the fore-cited place, *I, even my Hands, have stretch'd out the Heavens, and all their Hosts have I commanded*, *Is. 45. 12.* So *Psal. 33. 9.* *He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.* So the same *Psalmist* speaking of the *Heaven*

of Heavens, saith, *He commanded and they were created*, Ps. 148. 5. Nay, in the Account given by *Moses of the Creation*, 'tis evident that the Energy of no created Being cou'd intervene between God's *Will or Command*, and the *Effect* to be produced. He said, *Let there be Light, and there was Light*, Gen. 1. 3. And what Influence cou'd any Instrument have in such a Production? There is in Creation no pre-existent Matter, and therefore nothing for an Instrument to fix upon.

Besides, when they tell us, that God made this *præ-existent Nature of Christ* his Instrument in the *Creation of the World*, they either mean, that he communicated thereto a *finite* or an *infinite Power* in order to his concurring in this Work of Creation. If they say an *infinite Power*, they blasphemously *Deifie a Creature*, by ascribing to it the incommunicable Perfection of the Divine Nature. If only a *finite Power*, such a *finite Power* can signify nothing at all to the Work of *Creation*, which plainly requires no less than a *boundless or infinite Power* to effect it. For 'tis the highest Act of Power (the *ultimum quod sic* of Omnipotence) to give Being to that which was nothing before. And nothing can be impossible to the Being that can do this. 'Tis therefore far beyond the Reach of a finite Power.

4. The *Creation* of all things is ascrib'd to our Lord Jesus in Expressions that exclude him from the Rank of *Creatures*.

He who was God, and by whom all things were made, and without whom not any thing was made that was made, was himself *unmade*, and therefore *Eternal*. He can be no *Creature*, by whom all things were created, and who was before all *Creatures*. He that was before the Mountains were brought forth, and before the Earth or the World was form'd, is (in the Psalmist's Account) from everlasting to everlasting God, Psal. 90. 2.

And for what may be objected from the Apostle's calling our Saviour the First-born of all *Creatures*, (or rather of the whole Creation) it will appear to be

be of no Force to prove that Christ himself was a Creature, if we consider that 'tis sufficient to justify his being call'd the *First-born of the whole Creation*, because he transcends all Creatures both in *Duration* and in *Dignity*. He is both *before 'em* in Time, and is the *Lord* and *Heir* of 'em. But it cannot here import his being of the same Nature with 'em, because that would make the Apostle *Paul* both contradict himself in the Reason he adds, *viz. that all things were created by him*; and to contradict St. *John*, who saith, *without him nothing was made that was made*, John 1. 3. And the Apostle himself explains his own Sense, when at v. 17. he adds, *that he was before all things*. And 'tis observable that the *Phrase* is alter'd, when the Apostle by *First-born* means one of the same Nature. See at v. 18. and at *Rom.* 8. 29. as will appear to such as can consult the Original.

And for *Christ's* being call'd *the Beginning of the Creation of God*; the Word ἀρχή, when it does not refer to *Time*, does usually signify either the *efficient Cause*, or the *Head* and *Chief*: And neither of those Senses implies our *Lord* to be himself a Creature, but rather implies the contrary.

Having thus prov'd both that the Scriptures ascribe the *Creation of the World* to our *Blessed Saviour*, and that his *Creating* it is a demonstrative Argument of his *Almighty Power*, I shall only briefly subjoin, that the Scriptures ascribe to our *Blessed Lord* other *Works* that are the Effects of an *Almighty Power*, and are in Scripture appropriated to the *Blessed God*.

Thus what the *Psalmist* ascribes to the great *Je-rovah* at *Psal.* 14. 30. the inspired Writer to the *Hebrews* ascribes to the Son of God, *that he upholds all things by the Word of his Power*. 'Tis God that quickens the Dead, 'tis he alone that can kill and make alive, *Rom.* 4. 17. 2 *Kings* 5. 7. And yet our *Lord Jesus* attributes to himself the *Power of quickning whom he will*. He can by his commanding Voice cause the Dead to hear, and rise out of their

Graves, *John* 5. 21, 25, 28. And his thus raising the Dead, and *changing our vile Body to fashion it like to his glorious Body*, is by the Apostle Paul said to be effected, according to the working of his mighty Power, whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself, *Phil.* 3. 21. Expressions that import his Power to be absolute and irresistible.

Having thus shewn, that the Scriptures ascribe such absolute Omnipotence to our Blessed Lord, I come,

II. To examine what the Author has alledg'd to persuade us, that our Blessed Saviour himself disclaims this Perfection.

" 'Tis most evident, saith he, that our Lord Jesus,
 " (whatever Power he had) confesses again and again,
 " that he had not infinite Power of himself, *John* 5.
 " 30. Of my self I can do nothing. He had been
 " speaking of great Miracles, viz. Raising the Dead,
 " and Executing all Judgment; but all along takes
 " care Men should know his Sufficiency for these
 " things was of God the Father. In the Beginning of
 " the Discourse, ver. 19. The Son can do nothing but
 " what he sees the Father do. So in the middle, v.
 " 26, 27. The Father has given the Son to have
 " Life in himself. And as if he could never too
 " much inculcate this great Truth, he adds towards the
 " Conclusion, I can do nothing of my self, or from
 " nothing that is my self do I draw this Power and
 " Authority. Sure this is not the Voice of God, but
 " of a Man! For the most High can receive from
 " none; He cannot be made more mighty or wise, &c.
 " because to absolute Perfection can be no Addition.
 " And since Power in God is an Essential Perfection,
 " it follows that if it be deriv'd, then so is the Essence
 " and Being it self, which is Blasphemy against the
 " most High. For 'tis to Ungod him, to number him
 " among poor, dependent, derivative Beings. Whilst
 " the Supreme God indeed is only he who is the first
 " Cause, and absolute Original of all.

Ans. It is no good Argument of the Author's Impartiality in his Enquiries, that he only picks out

a few Expressions that seem to favour the Opinion he has embrac'd, without taking the least Notice of the Evidence suggested in the Context on the other Side. And that he does so in this Place, will appear upon a fuller View of the whole Passage.

We read at *ver. 18.* *that the Jews sought to kill our Lord Jesus, because he had wrought a miraculous Cure on the Sabbath Day.* Our Lord answers 'em, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; q. d.* tho' my Father is said to rest on the Seventh Day from the Works of Creation, yet he does still work in the continued Administrations of his Providence on the Sabbath Day, and I (who am his Son, and therefore One with him) do also work on that Day, and do nothing herein contrary to his Will. Upon this we read, *that the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal to God.* Or, as the Words may be more truly rendered, *because he call'd God his own Father, making himself equal to God, i. e.* call'd him his Father in so peculiar a Sense as argu'd his Equality to him in Power and Dominion. Now according to our Author, the Jews charge our Blessed Lord with the highest Blasphemy that he can be guilty of, and very justly according to his Sentiments, if they did not mistake his Meaning. It must therefore be duly consider'd, whether our Lord disowns this Sense they put on his Words, and saith any thing to undeceive 'em, and convince 'em that he meant no such thing. And if it appear that what he saith rather justifies the Sense they put on his Words than disowns it, it will thence follow, that he owns the Charge, that he *did so call God his Father as to make himself equal to him.*

Our Lord begins at his Reply at *ver. 19.* *Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, except he see the Father doing it. For whatsoever things he (i. e. the Father) does, those things the Son does likewise.* Now the Meaning is not as our Author wou'd insinuate, *That the Son can do nothing by any Power of*

his own : But, *That he can do nothing but what he sees the Father do*, i. e. nothing but what is conformable to his Example, and his Will and Order ; or as in the next ver. *Nothing but what the Father, who loves him, shews him*, i. e. directs and orders to be done in order to his own Glory. But that his *Power* is the same with his *Father's* he plainly intimates, when he saith in the following Words, *That whatever things the Father does, the same things does the Son likewise*, (for 'tis in the Original ταυτα) ; so that we may more justly cry out than our Author, *Sure this is the Voice of a God, and not of a Man!* For what *Creature* can or dare to pretend that whatever the *Father Almighty* do's, he can do the very same? And how plainly does he that saith this, *equalize himself to the Father*, as possessor of the same *Essential Power* with him? And so he does again at v. 21. *For as the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickneth them, so does the Son quicken whom he will.* And thus to raise and quicken the Dead at his own Pleasure, is evidently the peculiar Effect of an Almighty Power, Rom. 4. 17. 2 Kings 5. 7. And tho' it is said at v. 24. *That as the Father hath Life in himself, so he has given the Son to have Life in himself* : This does by no means imply the Son to be such a *Dependent Derivative Being* as *Creatures* are, but the contrary. For to have *Life in himself*, and a *Capacity of imparting it to whom he will*, is the peculiar Perfection of the *Self-living God*. And the *Father's giving this to the Son* imports not a *voluntary Gift*, but his communicating this and all other Divine Perfections to him by a necessary Eternal Act (which Divines call *Eternal Generation*). 'Tis true indeed, an *Authority* or *Right* to judge the World mention'd at ver. 22. and 27. is a *voluntary Gift*, which our Author unadvisedly confounds with *Christ's Essential Power* : And that *Authority* belongs to *Christ* as *Mediator*, and is to be exercis'd by him in our Nature as he is the *Son of Man* ; as our Lord plainly tells us at ver. 27. *He hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also because he is the Son of Man.* Whereby he both intimates, that he should judge the World in that Hu-
man

man Nature that he assum'd, and shou'd have this Honour conferr'd on him for assuming it, viz. That the World shou'd not be *Judged by the Father, but all Judgment committed to the Son.* But for the *Essential Power* whereby the Dead shou'd be rais'd in order to their being judg'd, that belongs not to him as *Man*, but as the *Eternal Son of God.* The Dead (saith he at ver. 25.) *shall hear the Voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.* And here 'tis manifest that our Saviour plainly distinguishes these two Titles or Characters that belong to him, viz. The *Son of God*, and the *Son of Man.* And makes the former the Ground of his *Divine Power or Might*, the latter of his *Delegated Authority.* And for what our Saviour adds in the Conclusion, *I can of my self do nothing, as I hear, I judge, and my Judgment is just, because I seek not my own Will, but the Will of the Father that sent me;* these Words refer not at all to his *Essential Power of Working*, but to his accurate Observance of the *Father's Will* in all his judicial Proceedings, to which his *Human Will* was entirely conformable, and his *Divine* the same with it.

But because I do allow the *Essential Power* of the *Son of God* to be communicated to him by the *Father*, I must take some Notice of his Reasoning against it. " *Since Power in God is an Essential Perfection, it follows that if it be deriv'd, then so is the Essence or Being it self.* *Ans.* If by being deriv'd he means communicated by the *Father* to the *Son*, not by a voluntary Act, but by the *Son's* necessary *Eternal Emanation* from him, we grant that the *Son* thus derives his *Essence or Divine Nature* from the *Father.* What then? " *Why this (says the Author) is Blasphemy against the most High, for 'tis to Ungod him, to number him among poor, dependent, derivative Beings: Whilst he who is the Supreme God is only he who is the first Cause and absolute Original of all.*

Ans. If by poor, dependent, derivative Beings, he mean such as are the voluntary Productions of a Being distinct from themselves, that depend on his meer Pleasure for their Existence and the Continuation

ation thereof, I deny that the *Son of God* is any such poor, dependent, derivative Being, or that he is number'd among such by our Concession, That the Father communicates the Divine Nature, and the Perfections thereof, to him by a Necessary, Eternal and Permanent Act. Nor is he hereby constituted another Being from the Father at all, but only another Person in the Godhead. Nor does this hinder him from being the Supreme God, i. e. the first Cause and absolute Original of all other Beings (as I have shewn the Scriptures assert him to be) tho' he be not first in the Godhead in respect of the Order of Subsistence and Operation between those Sacred Three that are the One Supreme God.

But the Author adds, our Lord considers himself here in Opposition to his Father, who (he saith) gave him all Power. Now if he had such an Eternal Divine Word, united more nearly to him than the Father, surely he wou'd have own'd his Power to be from that Word or Divine Son.

Answer. There is no such Phrase in all the Context as the Father's giving all Power to our Blessed Lord, but only giving him Authority to execute Judgment, because he is the Son of Man, at ver. 27. But to pass by that. By Power the Author either means Might and Strength, or Authority. If the former; 'tis evident, That this Almighty Power belongs to Christ as the Eternal Word or Son of God. And he is possess'd of it by a necessary Eternal Emanation from the Father, who communicates it by a necessary, not an arbitrary, free Act. And this Power the Man Christ Jesus was never possess'd of at all, no more than of any other incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature. If by Power he means, Authority to judge the World (which is all the Text here speaks of) we own this to be the Father's voluntary Gift, and that the Human Nature is employ'd in the Exercise of it. And this Authority shou'd in all reason be deriv'd from the Father, who sustains the Character of Supreme Lawgiver, not from the Eternal Word, who assum'd the Office of Mediator.

He

He concludes, "How comes he to ascribe nothing to that, since 'tis suppos'd to be equal in Power to the Father himself, and more nearly ally'd to Jesus Christ as the Operating Principle in him. So John 14. 10. My Father in me does the Works, by which 'tis evident, There was no Divine Agent in and with him but the Father. He only has all Power of himself, and needs no Assistance.

Ans. I have already shewn him, That our Lord Jesus, as the *Eternal Word* or *Son of God*, does claim a *Divine Almighty Power*, in telling us, That whatever things the Father does, he the Son does the same likewise. But against this he starts a new Argument from John 14. 10. where our Lord said to Philip, *Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The Words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my self, but the Father that dwells in me, he does the Works.* And in the next ver. *Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me, or else believe me for the Works sake.* But what wou'd our Author infer hence? He cannot reasonably conclude more from hence, than that the Works of our Lord Jesus proceeded from that *Almighty Power* that was both in the Father and in Him. So that by those very Works the Father himself attested the Mission of the Son, and his Unity in Nature and Essence with himself. Thus also the miraculous Works of Christ are frequently ascrib'd to the *Holy Spirit*, and the imputing them to a Diabolical Power is condemn'd as the unpardonable Blasphemy against the *Holy Ghost*. But because both the Father and the *Holy Spirit* did dwell and operate in the *Human Nature* of Christ; it will not follow, that the *Eternal Word* did not do so too, and that in a peculiar and more eminent manner. Christ indeed as a Prophet rais'd from among his Brethren, and sent on the Father's Embassie, was to manage that Office under the Inspiration and Conduct of that *Holy Spirit* that was given to him without measure, and to confirm his Mission by those miraculous Operations of the *Holy Spirit*, that were the Father's *Credentials*.

dentials. And for this reason these Works are imputed so often to the *Holy Spirit* and to the *Father*, and not because the *Eternal Word* was destitute of the Power of doing 'em. (a)

And now let the *Author* consider, whether these Passages in which he pretends our *Saviour* disclaims *Almighty Power*, and which are capable of so easy a Solution which the Context it self leads us to, are to be put in the Ballance with those that so manifestly ascribe the Creation to him, that undoubted Demonstration of the *Eternal Power and Godhead* of the *Creator*? And whether he be not in Danger of blaspheming our *Saviour* by thus *Ungodding him*, and *numbring him with poor, derivative, dependent Beings*? For among such he is pleas'd to rank him.

Having dispatch'd this Head of *Absolute Power*, I come next to that,

II. Of *Supreme Absolute Goodness*. This I fully agree with the *Author* to be a *prime Character of the Supreme Being*.

And therefore I shall, *First*, briefly shew, That such *Absolute Goodness* belongs to our *Blessed Saviour*; and, *Secondly*, consider what he alledges to persuade us that our *Saviour* disclaims it.

First, I shall briefly shew, That our *Blessed Saviour* is posses'd of such *Supreme Absolute Goodness*.

Now this *Supreme Goodness* discovers it self to us these two ways; Either,

1. By *Communicating Being to all Creatures*. Or,
2. By *Redeeming and Recovering 'em when Self-destroy'd and Lost*.

1. I have already shewn, That our *Lord* has given *Being to all Creatures*.

And I need not enlarge to shew, That is an Effect of *Goodness*, as well as *Power*, truly *Divine* and *Infinite*. And,

(a) See Dr. *Whisby's* Preface to his Commentary on *John*.

2. *For the Redemption and Recovery of Guilty and Self-destroyed Sinners*, I hope I need not prove to any that pretends to the Name of a Christian, that this Work is ascrib'd to our *Blessed Saviour*.

And one wou'd think there is as little need to prove, that this is an Effect of *Supreme Goodness and Infinite Love*. I am sure 'tis a *Love* that the Apostle Paul invites us to *comprehend the breadth and length, and height and depth of*, and tells us, *that it surpasses all our Knowledge*, Eph. 3. 18, 19. Nay, 'tis a *Goodness and Love* so truly *Divine*, as to warrant our ascribing in our most solemn Devotions, the same *Eternal Glory and Dominion*, to him who thus lov'd us, and wash'd us from our sins in his own Blood, &c. which we elsewhere ascribe unto the Father, Rev. 1. 5. compar'd with 1 Pet. 5, 11. (as I shall more fully shew anon). And indeed his Love will appear thus boundless and incomprehensible, and truly worthy of *Eternal Adoration*, if we consider our *Blessed Saviour* as the *Eternal Word*, who not only assum'd our Nature into a vital indissoluble Union, but in that very Nature stoop'd so low as to die in the stead of such Rebels and Enemies as we were, and to shed his precious Blood for the Expiation of our Guilt. And so we are taught to consider him, as one who was in the *Form of God*, and had appear'd with all the marks of divine Majesty and Glory, but for our sakes *divested himself* of all that external Glory, took on him the *Form of a Servant*, and was made in the *Likeness of Men*; Nay, being found in the *fashion of Man*, he humbled himself yet lower, even to so astonishing a degree, as to become obedient to Death, even the *Death of the Cross*, Phil. 2. 7, 8. For when we contemplate the infinite distance and disproportion there is between the divine Nature and Ours, we cannot but see, Here is an Instance of Love, not only beyond all example or parallel of Human Love, but sufficient to justify the highest Commendations the Scriptures give of it, sufficient to raise and entertain the admiring thoughts and views of *Angels and Men*. For what Love can be greater than

than this, that the *Prince of Life* and *Lord of Glory*, shou'd in our Nature and Stead submit to the *painful*, and *shameful*, and *accursed* Death of the Cross?

But if, with our Adversaries, we shou'd conceive of our *Blessed Saviour* only as a Creature, as a *Man*, or (in our Author's Phrase) a *poor, derivative, dependent Being*, who laid down his Life for us, and that with the prospect of the highest Dignity and Glory that a Creature is capable of, as the Reward of his Sufferings, Then indeed his Goodness and Love is but finite, and may be easily comprehended, and is far from surpassing our Knowledge, and wou'd be as far from warranting either such high Elogiums of it as the Inspired Writers give us, or the Doxologies they direct us to offer on the account of it. And no wonder that those that think there is no more in the Dying Love of our Saviour, shou'd deny him to be possess'd of *Supreme Goodness*. But whose Opinion and the Consequences thereof are most conformable to the Language of Scripture, *Ours* or *Theirs*, I freely leave to every serious Christian to judge.

And proceed,

Secondly, To examine, what the Author has alledg'd to persuade us, that our Blessed Saviour disclaims any such supreme Absolute Goodness.

And here his whole Proof relies on one single Passage.

"Our Lord (saith he) expressly disclaims this Character, Matt. 19. 17. Why callest thou me Good? There is none good but One, that is God. Where 'tis most evident that he distinguishes himself from God, as not the same with him, and denies of himself what he affirms of God. And for that Divine Perfection of supreme infinite Goodness, he challenges the Man for presuming to say what seem'd to attribute it to him, and leads him off to another, who, and who only, was more eminently so.

Ans. I deny that our Saviour does either expressly disclaim the Character of Good, or distinguish himself from God as not the same with him; which is all the foundation of the Author's Reasoning from this

this Text. We do not (as the Author groundlessly imputes to us) suppose our Saviour's Meaning to be, *I know Man, thou dost not take me for God, as I am, Why then dost thou give me the Title that belongs to him only?* For we do not suppose that our Saviour design'd to discover his Deity to him at this time. Nor did the young Man's Question give him any occasion for it. Nor do we think that the young Man took our Saviour to be *God*, when he call'd him *Good*, or that he paid him any more than a *civil Respect*; but 'tis probable (from his giving him the Title of *good Master*) that the young Man did take him for a *Rabbi* or *Doctor* of eminent Piety and Sanctity. And we know the *Jewish Rabbi's* affected such pompous and swelling Titles. See *Matt. 28.* from 7 to the 11th ver. Accordingly the Young Man addresses him in the common strain they us'd to the Jewish Doctors. Now our Blessed Lord, to discountenance this Affectation of High Titles, and set before this young Man an Example of Humility, in opposition to the Vanity and Self-conceit he discover'd, intimates to him that the Title he gave him was in its highest Sense proper only for *God*, and not for such a one as he took him to be, viz. a *Rabbi* or *Teacher of the Law*. And the Man does not say (as our Author pretends) *what Jesus Christ thought too much to be said of himself*, but only *what was too much to be said according to those apprehensions he knew that he had of him*. Nor was it at all necessary that our Blessed Saviour shou'd rectify his apprehensions at this time by discovering his Deity to him. He that had charg'd his own Disciples a little before, *That they should tell no Man, that he was Jesus the Christ, or Messiah, Mat. 16. 20.* (tho' he really was so, and intended in due time openly to claim that Title) might much more think it incongruous to reveal and assert his Deity to this young Profelyte. For that were to have gravell'd a raw Catechumen at first dash with the sublimest Mystery of Christian Godliness. He must be first taught to own him as the *Messiah*, before he was fit to be

instructed in the *Dignity and highest Characters* that belong'd to him *as such*. So that our Saviour's Case was like that of a *Prince that walks incognito, and in disguise*; He had divested himself of that *External Glory that was the Form of God*, to put on that of a *Servant*. And shou'd such a *Prince in disguise* be accosted by any that knew him not, with *Complements* too high for a *Subject*; Might he not say, *Why do you give me a Title more proper to be given your Prince*? This wou'd indeed argue that he design'd at present to *conceal*, but by no means to *deny or disown*, his *Royal Authority*. And the Cases being parallel; the *Author* very unreasonably infers from the like Expressions, that our Saviour here *disowns his Goodness*. Nor was there any necessity that the Evangelists in recording this passage shou'd enter a Caution, That Christ did not intend by these words to deny that he was *Good, and truly God*. The Title of *God* they so often give to him, and that matchless *Grace of our Lord Jesus*, which elsewhere the Inspired Writers of the New Testament so largely on all occasions extol, was sufficient to guard any considerate Reader from so grossly misinterpreting such an occasional passage. And therefore for the *Author* to cry out on this occasion, " 'Tis astonishing to see what violence is offer'd to this Sacred Text by such as maintain the Equality of Jesus Christ to God his Father, when he has said nothing of any weight against the common Exposition but what is founded on his own misrepresentation of it, shews us, How Natural it is, when Reason and Argument fail, to bear the World down with meer Confidence. For his Reasonings are scarce any where thro' his Book so trifling and weak as on this Head, on which he makes this vehement Exclamation without the least tolerable ground. 'Tis much more astonishing that a Man of his Abilities shou'd lay so mighty stress on so weak an Argument, for 'tis he offers real violence to our Saviour's words to make 'em serve his purpose, when he pretends, That our Saviour apparently denies, That he was Good in as high a sense as God his Father.

I proceed to the

III^d Perfection, of *Absolute Omniscience*, or Unlimited Knowledge of all things, past, present and to come.

In treating of this part of the Argument, I shall

First, *Prove the Holy Scriptures do ascribe such Absolute Omniscience to our Blessed Lord.*

Secondly, *Examine what the Author has offer'd to the contrary.*

First, I shall prove, *That the Holy Scriptures ascribe such absolute Omniscience to our Blessed Lord.*

And here I shall have occasion to consider what the *Author* has offer'd to invalidate the Proofs commonly brought to evince that this Perfection belongs to our *Blessed Saviour*.

I. We argue from those many Passages in the New Testament, wherein the *Knowledge of all things* is ascribed to our *Lord Jesus*. Such as those *John 2. 23, 24, 25.* *Many believed on his Name when they saw the Miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself to 'em, because he knew all Men; and needed not that any shou'd testify of Men, for he knew what was in Man.* So *John 16. 30.* *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things and needest not that any Man should ask thee. By this we believe that thou camest forth from God.* And again *John 21. 17.* *Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love thee.* Now we conclude, That an Universal Unlimited Knowledge belongs to him, according to the plain sense of these Expressions.

To this the *Author* replies, That “ *these words are intended only to express a great and comprehensive Knowledge. As will appear (he saith)*

“ 1. *By Christ's own words, who knew not the day of Judgment.*

Ans. This I shall afterwards consider as his main Objection.

2. “ *In that it was common to ascribe all Knowledge to Men of extraordinary Wisdom. (As he endeavours to shew by several Instances.)*

Now

Now this I deny, nor do any of the Instances he alledges prove it.

The *Woman of Tekoah* never meant to ascribe to *David* any more than an accurate Knowledge of all the Affairs of his own Kingdom, when she tells him, *My Lord knows all things on Earth, and is as wise as an Angel*, 2 Sam. 14. 20. And she imputes this Knowledge only to his Sagacity and Wisdom. Besides the Expressions themselves appear at first view *hyperbolical*, and have an air of *Court flattery* in 'em.

For that of *Christians* being said to *know all things*, The Context restrains it to those things which the *Anointing* teaches all *Christians*, i. e. the necessary *Doctrines* of the Gospel.

And for the words of *Simon* concerning our Lord, *If this Man were a Prophet, he would know what manner of Woman this is*, Luke 7. 39. They rather charge him (as some think) for a defect of *Holiness* than of *Knowledge*, viz. That he was not sufficiently inquisitive to know who this Woman was that touch'd him, as the *Pharisees* usually were very nice and scrupulous lest they shou'd be defiled by the touch of such as they call'd Sinners. But if they refer to his *Knowledge*, and imply, That *Simon* thought a Prophet might by Revelation ordinarily so far know a notorious Sinner as was requisite to his avoiding the Defilement of being touch'd by such a one: This signifies nothing to prove, That they thought their Prophets *knew all things*.

And for the *Woman of Samaria*, she might justly conclude our Lord to be a Prophet from his discovering her secret acts to her; but it does by no means then follow, That either *Jews* or *Samaritans* thought their Prophets *knew the secrets of all Men*, and much less that they *knew all things*, which the Disciples in the Places alledg'd ascribe to our *Blessed Saviour*, and to which there is nothing parallel in all these Instances. But

3. The Author adds, " 'Tis evident, that the Disciples by attributing all Knowledge to Christ, in-

" tended

“tended no more than to ascribe to him such great
“Knowledge as a Created Being is capable of, because
“they infer no more from it than this, Now we be-
“lieve that thou camest forth from God, i. e. Not
“that he was God, but One sent of God.

Answ. The Author has no reason to conclude from these words, *Now we believe thou camest forth from God*, that the Disciples inferred no more than Christ's being sent forth of God, as other Prophets were. For they are not said to come forth from God, when they are sent on his Message. And that our Lord, to whose own words (at ver. 28.) the Disciples refer, intended to affirm more of himself, when he saith, *I came forth from the Father*, than meerly his being sent as a great Prophet, we have just ground to suppose. For elsewhere he declares his own Nature to be as incomprehensible as that of the Father. *No Man knows the Son but the Father, and no Man knows the Father but the Son, and to whomsoever the Son will reveal him*, Mat. 11. 27. Again we are told, *John 1. 18. No Man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the Bosom of the Father, he has declared him.* Where the only-begotten Son of the Father is distinguish'd from all Men, and consequently from all meer Prophets, as one whose peculiar Privilege it was to be in the Bosom of the Father, acquainted with all his Councils, and therefore capable to declare 'em. And our Blessed Lord, as the only-begotten Son of God, plainly equals his own Knowledge with the Father's, when he tells his Disciples, *That the Spirit of Truth whom he would send, shou'd glorify him. For (saith he) he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it to you. All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you*, John 16. 13, 14, 15. And to the like purpose our Lord saith, *John 6. 46. Not that any Man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, (ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, He that hath his Essence from God) he hath seen the Father.* And 'tis observable that our Blessed Saviour gives himself this Character, in opposition to the Jews,
G that

that said, *Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose Father and Mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from Heaven?* He justifies what he had said, *That he came down from Heaven*, and had a higher Descent than that from his Mother on Earth, as the *only-begotten Son of God*, who had his Essence from him, and whose peculiar Privilege it was to *see him*. So that our *Author's* only and considerable Objection against the Obvious Sense of these Passages appears to be founded on a mistaken Supposition, That the Disciples inferr'd no more from that *Knowledge of all things*, which they ascribe to him, than that *he was the greatest of Prophets*.

And for what our *Author* subjoins at the Conclusion of this first Argument for the Omniscience of Christ, "*That tho' Christ should be allow'd to know all things which actually are, unless he know all Futurities too, it would not prove his infinite Omniscience;*" I shall have occasion to consider it under the next Head.

I shall only add, That in that passage of the Apostle Peter's, *Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee*, 'tis manifest, that the Apostle infers Christ's Knowledge of the hidden Disposition of his very Soul towards him, from the boundless extent of his Knowledge, *q. d.* The secrets of my Heart cannot be hid from thee, to whom all things are known. And if such all-comprehensive Knowledge had not belong'd to our *Blessed Saviour*, we might reasonably expect that he wou'd have check'd this excessive Language of the *Apostle* here, or at least he wou'd not have so openly countenanc'd and approv'd the like Language from the rest of the *Disciples*, as he plainly does, *John 16. 31.*

But the Language of the *Apostles* will appear no way *hyperbolical*, if we consider, That our *Lord* himself more fully claims such *Omniscience*. But this leads me to the

II^d Argument for the *Omniscience of Christ*, drawn from those Passages of Scripture that ascribe to him
that

that *Knowledge of the Hearts of Men*, which is peculiar to the divine Understanding.

That the *Knowledge of the Hearts of Men* is peculiar to an *Omniscient Being*, even to the *All-knowing God*, is evident from several Passages of Scripture.

It was so in the Judgment of the wisest of Men, *Solomon*, as is evident from that passage in his Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple, when he requests, *That God may give every Supplicant, according to his Ways, whose Heart* (saith he) *thou knowest, For thou, even thou only, knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men*, 1 Kings 8. 38, 39. So the Psalmist makes it the peculiar Glory of him whose *Throne is in Heaven*, *That his Eyes behold, and his Eye-lids try the Children of Men*, Psal. 11. 4. Nay the Psalmist elsewhere mentions it as one eminent Instance of that *Knowledge of God*, which appear'd to him so wonderful and incomprehensible, *That he had search'd and known him, That he was not only acquainted with his ways, but even understood his thoughts afar off*, Psal. 139. 1, 2, 3, &c. And sure that one passage of the Prophet *Jeremiah* is sufficient to put this matter past all reasonable doubt, when he brings in the Blessed God, assuming this to himself as the incommunicable Privilege and Glory of his infinite Mind, *The Heart of Man is deceitful and desperately wicked, Who can know it?* q. d. No Creature whatever can pretend to so marvellous a Knowledge as this. It exceeds the limited Capacity of a finite Mind. The Blessed God therefore assumes it to himself as his peculiar Perfection, *I the Lord search the Heart, I try the Reins, to give to every Man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of their doings*, Jer. 17. 9, 10.

Now that the Scriptures do ascribe this *Knowledge of Mens Hearts* (which they thus appropriate to God) to our *Blessed Saviour*, is no less evident: And that not only from several of the Passages mention'd before, and many others that might be added, but from our Lord's express Declaration. *The Churches* (saith he) *shall know that I am he, which searches the Hearts and the Reins, and will give to every Man according to their*

their Works, Rev. 2. 23. And the Apostle *Paul* to the same purpose declares, That our Lord *Jesus* will come to *bring the hidden works of Darkness to Light*, and to make manifest the Counsels of all Hearts, 1 Cor. 4. 5.

Now one wou'd think this Argument to be clear and decisive in this Dispute, when what the great *Jehovah* appropriates to himself in the *Prophet*, Our *Blessed Saviour* so openly lays Claim to in this remarkable Passage. But the Author has offer'd two things to take off the force of it, which I must consider.

To this purpose he proposes to consider, " 1. In what sense the searching and knowing the Heart is peculiar to God, and incommunicable to others. 2. To shew, That tho' it be peculiar to God in one sense, yet in another sense it may be attributed to another that is not the most High God.

As to the first (he saith) " *Tho' Solomon say, Thou Lord only knowest the Hearts of all Men, yet what if I say, That 'tis no wonder that Solomon shou'd not know of any other to whom that Excellency was Communicated, since he understood not the Mystery of the unsearchable Riches and fulness of Christ, &c.*

Ans. If our Author think fit to say so, We shall think fit to believe, That *Solomon* was wiser then he, and deliver'd his Prayer by a diviner Inspiration than appears in his *Book*. Especially when we find not only other *Inspired Writers* concurring with him, but even the *Blessed God* appropriating this Knowledge to himself, and distinguishing himself thereby from all Creatures whatsoever.

But he adds, " *That such Expressions appropriating some Perfections to God do only import, that he has no Equal to him therein, and that they belong to him in an Eminent sense. As when 'tis said God is only wise, Rom. 16. 27. God only hath immortality, 1 Tim. 6. 6. And accordingly, when the Scriptures appropriate the Knowledge of Mens Hearts to God, they mean only, That there is none knows the Heart so*

univer-

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 85

“ *universally, so immediately and independently as he.*
“ *So that he reckons we argue but weakly from Christ’s*
“ *knowing Mens Hearts, that he is God, unless we*
“ *shew that he knows ’em in the same excellent and in-*
“ *dependent manner and degree as the Father. But for*
“ *knowing Mens Hearts in a lower sense, by Revela-*
“ *tion, he tells us, This has been communicated to Pro-*
“ *phets, and Apostles, 2 Kings 6. 12. 1 Cor. 12. 10.*
“ *Acts 5. And this way Christ may know ’em much*
“ *more. Searching the Heart importing the accuracy*
“ *of Knowledge, not the manner of attaining it.*

Answ. That some of God’s Perfections, as his *Wisdom, Power, Knowledge, &c.* are communicable, I freely grant. But I must tell our *Author*, There are some *Acts* flowing from these Perfections that are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to any Created Being. So is that *Act* of his *Power*, *The making a Thing out of nothing.* And so (if we may believe the Scriptures) is that *Act* of the *Divine Understanding*, *The knowing the Hearts of Men*, i. e. *The knowing ’em by Immediate Intuition.* Foras to that *Knowledge of ’em* that is by *Revelation from another*, or is only *Conjectural*, it no way belongs to God at all, and none doubts but a *Prophet* or an *Apostle*, or the *Man Christ Jesus*, may thus know the Hearts of Men. The Question then is, Whether the *Blessed God* have not a peculiar way of *Knowing the Hearts of Men*, viz. by *immediate Intuition*, that is incommunicable to any other Being? If he have, it must then be enquir’d, Whether our *Lord Jesus* does not challenge to himself that very way of *Knowing the Hearts of Men*? That *God* has a peculiar way of *Knowing Mens Hearts*, viz. *Universally, Immediately, and Independently*, our *Author* grants: And so must any Man that duly considers the *Absolute Perfection of the Divine Understanding*,* and the unavoidable Imperfection of a finite Mind. Now I wou’d only ask him, Whether the *Blessed God* does not intend to assert his own peculiar way of *Knowing the Hearts of Men*, when he saith, *I the Lord search the Heart and try the Reins*? ’Tis evident that he

does so, because hereby he represents that perfect Knowledge of the deceitful Heart of Man, that absolutely distinguishes him from all Creatures whatever. *The Heart of Man is deceitful above all things, &c. Who can know it? I the Lord search the Hearts, &c.* Now if these Expressions represent God's peculiar and perfect way of Knowing Mens Hearts (as they must do, in order to their distinguishing him from all Created Beings) then that very perfect and peculiar way of Knowing Mens Hearts belongs to our Lord Jesus. For our Blessed Saviour asserts his Knowledge in those very Expressions, and that in the most emphatical manner. Our Author, that asserts the Knowledge of Christ's Human Nature to be so extensive, will not sure imagine him to be ignorant that the Blessed God had by the Prophet *Jeremy* represented his own Universal, Immediate, Independent Knowledge of the Hearts of Men by these Expressions. And yet our Lord Jesus uses the same to express his own Knowledge of 'em. Nay he does not barely say, *I search the Hearts, &c.* But *the Churches shall know that I am he that searches the Hearts, &c. q. d.* I am that *Jehovah* whom the Prophet there describes as the *Searcher of the Hearts and Reins*. Now if our Lord intended to apply this Passage of the Prophet to himself in the Sense there intended, our Point is gain'd, and there is no Room to dispute his Omniscience. If he did not, but only intended to apply these words to himself in a lower Sense, (*viz.* of his Understanding 'em by *Revelation from another*, or by *probable Conjecture*) nay in a Sense that could not agree to the Blessed God, we cannot excuse his words from palpable Blasphemy, and much less from the greatest Imprudence, and Neglect of his Father's Honour, since they so naturally lead all that read 'em to ascribe to him, whom the Author supposes but a *finite Creature*, the same Knowledge of Men's Hearts which the Prophet had appropriated to the great *Jehovah* before.

Nay, I may here, to confirm this Argument, add, that as the Scriptures assign *two* Grounds of God's perfect

perfect and immediate Knowledge of Men's Hearts, viz. partly *his having made 'em*, (a) and partly his intimate Presence with 'em, (b) So both these Grounds of it belong to our *Blessed Saviour*. I have already shewn, *that he made 'em*; and he himself asserts his own *Omnipresence*, when he promises *that where two or three are gathered together in his Name, he will be there in the midst of 'em*, Matth. 18. 20. See also Matth. 18. last ver. John 14. 20, 23. And if it should be pretended that those Texts speak of Christ's *Spiritual Presence* by the Influences of his Grace, this wou'd rather confirm than invalidate this Proof of his *Omniscience*. For as we therefore prove God is every where in respect of his *Essence*, because he can at the same time exert the power that is inseparable from his *Essence* in preserving and sustaining his *Creatures*, and directing or over-ruling their *Actions*: so we may infer, That Christ is every where in respect of his *Essential Presence* as *God*, because he can be every where at the same time, by his *Spiritual Influences* and gracious *Operations*. For that *Spiritual Virtue* is inseparable from his *Essence*.

Having thus shewn, That our *Blessed Saviour* claims the *Knowledge of Mens Hearts* in the same sense in which 'tis ascrib'd to the *Father*, I might justly pass by all he has offer'd under the 2d *Head*. But because there are several Mistakes in it, that need to be rectify'd in order to the clearing this Subject, I shall briefly consider it. Therefore,

Secondly, " *There is no Absurdity* (he tells us) *in* " *Attributing this Knowledge of the Heart to Jesus* " *Christ, tho' he be not the most High God. And* " *to that purpose, he argues, That the Object being but* " *finite, It does not exceed a finite Capacity to have* " *such an Universal Knowledge of the Hearts and* " *Ways of Men, as is ascribed to Jesus Christ.*

(a) See Psalm 33. 15. Psalm 139. 13. Amos 4. 13.

(b) Jer. 23. 24.

Ans. The *Author* shou'd have told us, *What Knowledge of Men's Hearts and Ways* he attributes to the Human Soul of *Christ*. Whether that unerring Knowledge of 'em by *immediate Inspection and Intuition* which belongs to the *Blessed God*, or only a Knowledge of 'em by *Révelation*, or by *probable Conjecture*. If the *former*, he runs his Head against all those numerous Texts foremention'd that appropriate that immediate Knowledge of the Hearts of Men to the *Blessed God*, and plainly robs the Divine Understanding of what the Scriptures celebrate as its incommunicable Privilege and peculiar Glory. If he mean only the *Latter*, We are willing to allow as much Knowledge of that kind to the *Humane Soul of Christ* as can agree to its finite Capacity: And tho' we cannot presume to define, how far such a finite Capacity can extend, yet we see no ground at all to extend it so far as our *Author* seems to do. As for Instance, We can by no means allow, that the *Humane Soul of Christ* actually knows all the *Words* and *Works*, nay all the very *Thoughts*, and *Desires*, and *Purposes* of all the *Men* that ever liv'd on this Earth in all the several Ages of the World. Nor does the Object of this Universal Knowledge being *finite*, prove that it exceeds not the Capacity of a *finite Mind*. The *World* it self, as the Object of God's *Power*, is but *finite*; But yet it requires an *infinite Power* to make, and sustain, and rule it. So tho' the *World* as the Object of God's *Knowledge* be but *finite*, it may require an *infinite Mind* to comprehend all the affairs of it. The *Psalmist* concludes from God's *telling the Number of the Stars*, *Pf. 147. 4, 5.* how much more may we conclude that *Understanding* to be *infinite*, that comprehends at once all the *Actions*, and the very *Thoughts* and *Purposes* both of *Angels* and of *Men*, and that from the Beginning of the World to this very Moment? What higher thing can we conceive of the *Divine Understanding*? Nay, if the *Author's* Argument were good, we cou'd not from the World that is but *finite* conclude, That the Maker of it is a Being possest of
infinite

infinite Perfections. But I take his Supposition to be so far from being true, that 'tis more probable that the minutest Creature as truly requires an infinite Mind fully to comprehend, as an infinite Power to make it.

But the *Author* pretends to prove, “*That we must ascribe such an universal Knowledge to Christ as Man, Because all Judgment is committed to him, and that as the Son of Man. And this Kingly Office by which he rules over all the World, and takes special Care of all his Members, as it necessarily supposes his Knowledge of the whole Estate of his Church, and every Member of it, as far as is necessary for the Discharge of that Trust, so it undeniably proves, this large Knowledge to be exercised by him as Man, however he gains it. For since this Office and Power are given, they cannot terminate in the Divine Nature : For who can give to God any Dignity or Power, who has all originally in his own Being ? It must be then given to the Man or Human Nature only, and consequently he must have all requisite Abilities for it.*”

Ans. The *Author's* Argument turns upon a false Supposition, *That this Authority to rule and judge the World is committed to Christ only as Man.* And the Text he alledges for it, is so far from proving it, that it plainly insinuates the contrary. The Words are, *The Father hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.* 'Tis not as he is the Son of Man, (as the *Author* unwarily and groundlessly asserts). *This Authority of executing Judgment is the Reward given to the Son of God, for becoming the Son of Man, and terminates upon the whole of his Person as he is God-Man, the Incarnate Word or Son of God.* And if we consider him as the *Word made Flesh*, and contemplate the *Fulness of the Godhead as dwelling Bodily in him*, he appears every way furnish'd with sufficient Abilities for the Execution of his Regal Office, in the Administration of the Affairs both of the *World*, and the *Church*.

But

But against this the *Author* objects, "That if this
 " Power be given, it cannot terminate on the Divine
 " Nature ; for who can give to God any Dignity
 " or Power, who has all originally in his own Being?"

Ans. Both the *Father* and the *Son* have the
 Power originally. And as it was the *Son's* voluntary
 Condescension to sustain the Character of *Mediator*,
 so was it the *Father's* voluntary Act to devolve for
 a time all the Exercise of this Original Power of ru-
 ling and judging the World on his *Incaruate Son*.
 That the *Father* judges no Man, but has committed all
 Judgment to the *Son*, is a temporary Suspension of
 his own Right, and therefore justly represented as a
 Gift : The *Son* acquires hereby no Authority that
 did not originally belong to his *Divine Nature*, but
 he has this Dignity conferr'd on him by a voluntary
 Act of the *Father*, that the Exercise of this Original
 Power is solely entrusted (during the present State
 of Tryal) in his Hands. And this Privilege the *Fa-
 ther* was capable of Giving, and the *Son* of Receiving,
 notwithstanding his Unity in Essence with the *Father*.

And indeed were this Authority devolv'd into the
 Hands of a *meer Man*, we cou'd have no tolerable
 Ground to trust, either his Capacity of understanding
 all our particular Concerns, or of administering suita-
 ble Direction, Relief, Assistance, Comfort and Sup-
 port on all the various Occasions we have, of apply-
 ing our selves to him. 'Tis true indeed, his Human
 Nature does act its part in the Exercise of his Roy-
 al Authority (tho' how far its Power as well as Know-
 ledge extends, we cannot pretend to determine). But
 'tis the Perfections of his Divine Nature, that are a
 full Security to our Faith, that he is capable of be-
 ing (as the *Author* speaks) a careful, a vigorous,
 an Effectual Head of his Body, and Ruler of the
 World.

For what the *Author* saith, p. 14. Column 2d, it
 runs wholly upon his own Mistake of this Authority
 being committed only to *Christ's Human Nature*, and
 therefore we are neither concern'd in the Objection
 he proposes to himself, nor in his Answer to it.

He

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 91

He has another Argument to prove, *That this Universal Knowledge belongs to Christ*, drawn from his *sympathizing Compassion towards his suffering Servants*, and that arising from his own *Sufferings on Earth*, Heb. 15, 16. *Seeing we have not an High-Priest, that cannot be touch'd with the Feeling of our Infirmities, but was in all Points tempted as we are, let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace, &c.*

From thence the Author infers, "*That since Christ can only sympathize with his distressed Servants in his Human Nature, and cannot sympathize with 'em in their Troubles without knowing 'em, he must therefore know 'em all-as Man, or otherwise this Ground of our Hope and Consolation in our Approaches to God is taken away.*"

Ans. All that those Words of the inspired Writer to the *Hebrews* does necessarily import, is only this, That our Lord *Jesus* having been in our Nature tempted, and had an experimental Sense of the infirmities and Miseries we are liable to, is thereby the more capable of being a *Compassionate Intercessor* for us. But they do by no means import, that he has such a proper Sympathy with every distressed Christian, as we have with an afflicted Friend (for that were inconsistent with the perfect Felicity and Joy of his exalted State) and consequently they import not, that *as Man* he knows all their particular Miseries. 'Tis sufficient that his *Divine Nature* discerns all their particular Distresses, and the Remembrance he has of his own Sufferings in our Nature, renders him a compassionate and earnest Intercessor for 'em. Tho' shou'd we allow such a Knowledge of their present particular Cases to be communicated to his Human Nature by *Revelation* from the *Divine*, that is united to it, I do not see that this wou'd at all prove, That an universal Knowledge of all things past as well as present, may be communicated to his Human Nature: And much less wou'd it prove that immediate Knowledge of Mens Hearts to belong to him, which he so plainly ascribes to himself.

And

And for the *Authorities* he produces, he is hard put to it, when he is forc'd to shelter his own Opinion of the *Universal Knowledge of Christ's Human Nature*, under the Covert of that absurd Doctrine of the *Lutherans*, concerning the *Ubiquity* of it. They are Opinions well match'd, and we shall entertain both of 'em, when we have renounc'd our *Reason* as well as our *Bibles*.

And if he like their Company, we shall not envy him the Honour of ranking himself with those two *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria* and *Rome*, *Eulogius* and *Gregory*, if they cou'd no better confute the *Agnostæ* than his Citations from them wou'd argue they did: But since he directs us not where to find 'em, I shall not be at the needless Pains of seeking 'em to no purpose.

But for the three later Authorities he quotes, *Mr. Baxter's* is nothing to his purpose, as were easy to shew if it were to our present purpose. What he cites from the *Author of the Future State*, *Limborch*, and from *Dr. Goodwin*, does not ascribe to Christ's Human Soul so *Universal a Knowledge* as he does, and particularly not the *Knowledge of Mens Hearts*, about which the *Dispute* chiefly lies. And those *Authors* never perverted their dubious Speculations about the Extent of the Knowledge of Christ's *Human Understanding*, to rob him of the Glory of his *Divine*; to which alone, as I have shewn, that glorious Character can belong, of *searching the Heart and the Reins*.

Having thus prov'd the *Omniscience* of our *Blessed Saviour*, I proceed

II. To examine *What the Author has alledg'd to persuade us that our Lord Jesus does disclaim this Perfection*.

And for that he has but *one Text* to lay in the Ballance against all the Passages I have already mention'd and vindicated; and that is from *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that Day knows no Man, no not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father*. And to this Text the *Author* silyly but disingenuously adds, The
Father

Father only, when there is no such limiting Clause in the Text it self, but only at *Matth. 24. 36.* Now from this Text the Author thus argues, "Here the Son professes his Knowledge to be limited, and inferior to the Father's, i. e. The Son of the Father, or Son of God; the Son as above Angels in Knowledge, the Son in the most eminent Sense. Now how is it possible, the Son shou'd be God infinite, and yet have but a finite Understanding? &c.

Ans. The Author is very unhappy in his arguing from several Texts, without ever consulting the Context, (as has already appear'd in several Instances) and he is so in this. For if he please to look into it, he will find, that our Saviour does there describe himself in his final Appearance, (when he shall come in the Clouds with great Power and Glory, and shall send his Angels to gather his Elect from the four Winds, from the uttermost part of the Earth, to the uttermost part of Heaven) not as the Son of God, but as the Son of Man, at v. 26. And therefore we have all possible reason to understand him here speaking of himself at v. 32. under the same Character and Consideration. And even under that Character he may well enough speak of his Knowledge (in the Divine Counsels towards Mankind) as superior to that of Angels, and speak of God as his Father, without speaking of himself as the Son in the most eminent Sense.

Our Author being aware of this, exclaims against this Answer, as a meer Subterfuge, and Popular Evasion, which he intends to lay open the Vanity of. And to that purpose he offers several Remarks.

Before he enters on those Remarks, he demands, "What Intimation of any such Distinction of two Natures, we can point him to in these Discourses of Christ?"

Ans. I have already shewn him, That in the Passage he alledges against the Omnipotence of Christ, he does distinguish between his being the Son of God, and the Son of Man. That the Passage he alledges against his absolute Goodness is not to the purpose. And

And for this alledg'd against his Omniscience, the Context clearly limits the Sense of it. And since the Distinction of his *two Natures* is elsewhere clearly asserted, (See *John* 1. 14. *Rom.* 9. 5. *1 Tim.* 3. 16. and several other Places) there is no need it should be repeated on every Occasion.

I come therefore to consider his *Remarks*. And,
 I. He objects, "That our Blessed Lord Jesus, if
 " himself was the Supreme God in any Nature of his
 " own, cou'd not have said such things in any consisten-
 " cy with Truth and Sincerity. He cou'd not say, He
 " did not know the Thing he did know. For tho' we
 " shou'd suppose that he consisted of two infinitely di-
 " stinct Natures, and so had two Capacities of Know-
 " ledge; yet since himself includes both, it follows, that
 " the denying a Thing of himself in absolute Terms,
 " without any Limitation in the Words, or obvious Cir-
 " cumstances, does plainly imply a Denial of its belong-
 " ing to any part of its Person, or to any Nature in it.
 " For tho' I may affirm a thing of a Man that belongs
 " only to a part of him, yet I cannot justly deny a thing
 " of him which belongs to one part, because it belongs not
 " to another. As I cannot say, A Man is not wound-
 " ed, because tho' one Arm be shot or wounded, the
 " other is whole.

Ans. I might here justly suggest to our *Author*, how unreasonable it is to measure all our *Lord's* Expressions, concerning himself, by what may or may not be said of a *meer Man*: For that is to beg the Question, and take it for granted, That there is no such Union of two infinitely distinct Natures in him, as we judge to be clearly reveal'd in the Scriptures. And the *Author* has said nothing to refute Arguments we draw for it from such Passages as those fore-mention'd, *Joh.* 1. 14. *Rom.* 9. 5. *1 Tim.* 3. 16. *Col.* 2. 9. where he is stiled, *The Word made Flesh*, the *Seed of the Fathers according to the Flesh*, and yet God blessed for evermore, God manifested in the *Flesh*, One in whom the *Fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily*. But to convince our *Author* that he is mistaken in his Supposition, That nothing can be deny'd of a Person that

that belongs to any part of him, I shall give him a parallel Instance, relating to our *Blessed Lord*, in which he denies something of himself, without any express Limitation, which yet belongs to him, in respect of one of his Natures. Thus our *Blessed Saviour*, speaking of his approaching Ascension, at *John 17. 11.* saith, *And now I am no more in the World, and I come to thee, &c.* And again at *Matth. 26. 11.* *Ye have the Poor always with you, but Me ye have not always.* Here our Lord, without any express Limitation, asserts, That he shou'd upon his Ascension be no more in the World, and they shou'd not have him with them always. But this is only true with respect to his *Human Nature*, and *Bodily Presence*, and by no means true in respect of his *Divine Nature*, and the *Spiritual Energy and Presence* of that: For our Lord elsewhere tells his Disciples, *Lo, I am with you to the End of the World, Mat. 28. 20.* Nay he has promis'd, that where two or three are gather'd together in his Name, he will be in the midst of 'em, *Mat. 18. 20.* Nay he has assur'd every particular Christian, that the Father and He will come and make their Abode with him, *John 14. 23.* So that our Author might upon his Supposition, as reasonably charge our *Blessed Lord* with Insincerity, in denying without Limitation, his being in the World, and with his Disciples, when in respect of one of his Natures he shou'd be still in the World and with them, as he charges him with Insincerity here, on Supposition he had a *Divine Nature* in which he knew the Day of Judgment.

If the Author pretend, that in the Passages I alledge, tho' there be no Limitations in the Words, yet there is in the obvious Circumstances, which confine our Lord's Meaning to his *Bodily Presence as Man*, I grant it. And I have the same to alledge here; for the Context here does more expressly limit his Words to his *Human Nature*, by giving him that Appellation of the *Son of Man* that belongs only to his *Human Nature*, and cannot so refer to any pre-existent Nature that belong'd to him. So that the Words, as the Context leads us to expound 'em, are the

the same as if they had run, *Of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man, No not the Angels, which are in Heaven, Nor the Son of Man* (himself, that shall then so gloriously appear) *but the Father*. And if the *Author* shou'd here demand, How comes the *Son of Man* (if the words be limited to him) to be put before the *Angels*, as superior to them in Knowledge? I answer, Very justly; because, *as the Son of Man, he had the Spirit without measure*, and did transcend the *Angels* in the Knowledge of the Counsels and Will of God relating to the Salvation of the Sons of Men. He was in that Nature the principal Messenger of the *Father*, to reveal his Mind to us, not only above all other *Prophets*, but above *Angels* too, who never brought so clear and full a Declaration of the Divine Will as he has done. It appears therefore that our Lord does not deny without any Limitation, That *he knew not*, what *he knew in another Nature*: For the Context sufficiently limits his denial to his *Humane Nature*.

“ But our Author parallels the Case with that of a
 “ Man who having two Eyes, shuts one, and keeps the
 “ other open, and then denies, without Limitation, that
 “ he saw such a one with whom he convers'd, mean-
 “ ing, That he saw him not with the Eye that was
 “ shut, tho' he saw him with the Eye that was open.
 “ And as such a One wou'd be taken for a Liar or De-
 “ ceiver, so he thinks we virtually fix this Imputation
 “ on our Blessed Lord, by supposing, that having two
 “ knowing Capacities, he denies his knowing that abso-
 “ lutely and indefinitely, which he does know according
 “ to one of these Capacities.

Ans. One would think, that the *Author* shut both his Eyes in drawing this Parallel: For his Argument proceeds upon a false Supposition, both in *Anatomy*, and *Philosophy*, and *Divinity*.

He goes upon a false Supposition in *Anatomy* and *Philosophy*, That a Man has two *Visive Powers* (answerable to the two knowing Capacities, which we suppose in the *Son of God*, and the *Son of Man*) because he has two Eyes. But this all *Anatomists* will tell

tell him is a palpable mistake: For there is one common Sensory, where all the Nerves meet; and besides this, the Optick Nerves have a peculiar meeting-place, long before they come at this common Centre. And therefore we understand from sound *Philosophy*, that tho' there be variety of Organs subservient to Sensation, yet there is but one common Sensory or discerning Principle. It is not the *Eye* or *Nerve* sees, but the *Sensitive Soul* that resides where all these Organs meet: And since that sees whether *one Eye* or *both* be open, it were a down-right Falshood to say, I saw not a Man, because I only saw him with one Eye. But the Case is quite different where there are two knowing Principles belonging to two different Natures or Minds, the one *Finite*, the other *Infinite*. So that the *Author's* Simile is lame of one Foot, or (to speak in his own Strain) *winks with one Eye*; for the Foundation of his *Parallel* fails.

But he goes on as false a Supposition in *Divinity*, viz. That our Lord *absolutely* and *indefinitely* denies his knowing the Day of Judgment. But this I deny, and till he tear the 26th ver. out of the Chapter, the Context will, against all the Subtlety he can use, limit our Lord's Denial to one of his Knowing Capacities only, viz. To that which belong'd to him as the Son of Man.

But the *Author* argues, "That if Christ had a Divine Nature and Knowledge, no doubt his Disciples (who, if any Body, must be supposed to believe it) directed the Question to that, rather than to the imperfect Humane Capacity. And yet in Answer to it, he says, He knew not that Day, &c."

Ans. What he saith, No Doubt of, I positively deny, That on Supposition the Disciples believ'd the Divine Nature and Knowledge of Christ, they directed their Question to that, rather than to his imperfect Humane Capacity. For they knew, that Christ was in our Nature the Father's Messenger and Prophet, and as such cou'd declare no more to 'em, than what was revealed to his Humane Understand-

ing, and what he had Instructions from the *Father* to make known to 'em: And therefore never expected to learn from him, all that the *Eternal Word* knew, but only all that it pleased to impart to his *Humane Understanding* for their Instruction and Edification. They address'd their Enquiry to him as the *Son of Man*, and as a *Prophet and Teacher sent from God*, and expected to learn no more from him, than what he cou'd in that Capacity inform 'em of. And accordingly, our Lord, in answer to their Question, tells 'em, and that sincerely, *he knew it not*. And does it argue any Insincerity in the *Man Christ Jesus*, to deny his Knowledge of it, because that *Eternal Word* that was united to the *Humane Nature* (but yet was a Being entirely distinct from it, and cou'd communicate more or less of Light and Knowledge to the *Humane Understanding*, at its own free Pleasure) *knew it*? There is no Shadow of Guile or Insincerity in it.

But the *Author* is pleas'd further to parallel this Case with that of a *Popish Priest*, "*Who being examin'd about what he has known by Confession, saith he knows it not, and vindicates himself by saying, That the Priest in Confession knows matters only as God, and not as Man, therefore he may deny that he knew 'em, meaning as Man. This, the Author tells us, Dr. Stillingfleet censures as absurd, Because to say he does not know, is as much as to say, he does not any way know. Now saith the Author, If this be a good Answer against the Papists, as no doubt it is, Then sure 'tis so in the present Case. Therefore when Christ says, he knows not the Day of Judgment; 'Tis as much as to say, He does not any way know it. And consequently 'tis a vain Shift to say, It was as Man only. We must beware, lest we bring the Holy Jesus under such Reproach for Equivocation, as the Romish Priests lye under, and make the Jesuits themselves think they have a good Title to that Name, by imitating herein his own Example, which in this very Instance they alledge with so great Advantage, according to this Interpretation.*"

Ans.

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 99

Ans. The Author is very unhappy in the choice of his *Parallels*. For can any thing be more unreasonable and absurd than to parallel a *Romish Priest* that has but *One Understanding* or *Knowing Capacity*, with our *Blessed Saviour*, in whom we suppose *two infinitely distinct Natures*, and two so distinct Understandings, the *one finite*, the *other infinite*? Now I have shewn him the Case is plainly thus, The Disciples enquire of the *Son of Man*, as the great Prophet sent by the Father, concerning the Day of Judgment. (And I have already shewn him, That tho' we suppose 'em to believe the Union of his Humane Nature to the Eternal Word, they had no reason to address their Enquiry to him under that higher Character.) He, the *Son of Man*, and that most truly, tells 'em, *he knew it not*. For the *Man Christ Jesus*, to whom alone they address'd their Enquiry, *no way knew it himself*, and much less had it in his Instructions to reveal to them. And what tho' the *Eternal Word*, which had assumed the Humane Nature, *knew it*? Is it any Equivocation for the *Son of Man* to deny his Knowledge of it, when he really never had that Knowledge imparted to him? Is there any thing in this Case parallel to the *Priest's* denying his Knowledge of what he does really know, and solving it by ridiculously pretending, *That in Confession he knows matters only as God*? when he has but *one Nature*, and *one Understanding*, and is no more truly *God*, than the Author believes our *Blessed Saviour* himself to be. And therefore for the Author upon so groundless an Occasion to tell us, That our Interpretation enables the *Jesuits* to alledge our *Saviour's Example* to countenance their vile Practice of Equivocation with great Advantage, argues so great a defect both of true Judgment, and of that Humility that becomes any Man that opposes the common Faith of Christians, nay so great Irreverence to our *Blessed Saviour* himself, that I cannot let it pass without expressing some just dislike of it: And hope the Author will upon second Thoughts wish so indecent.

a Passage had never slip'd from his Pen in so serious and weighty a Debate.

I proceed to his

2d Remark. "*As a farther Evidence, (saith he) That Jesus Christ intended no such Distinction of two Natures as is pretended, 'Tis to be observ'd, That he puts not the Distinction between the Son of Man and the Eternal Word (as some speak) but between the Son and his Father. Not the Son knows, but only the Father, Mark 13. 32. (a) By which 'tis plain, He had no thought of including any Person or Nature of his own among the Excepted. For whatever was not the Father, he says, was ignorant of that Day. Now 'tis certain, that in no Nature was the Son the Father, and consequently where none but the Father knows, None who is not the Father can be intended. And since our Lord was making an Exception in the Case, he wou'd not have forgot to except the Eternal Word too, if there had been such a Divine Principle in himself, equal to the Father and distinct from him. For 'tis a known Rule that an Exception from a general Assertion confirms it to other Instances not Excepted.*"

Ans. The Father is here consider'd as the Dispenser of all Divine Revelations: And under that Notion he is oppos'd, Not to the *Eternal Word* and *Holy Spirit* that are *One* in Essence and Understanding with himself, But to those whom the Father employs as his Messengers to reveal his Will to Men. And so the Father is here oppos'd, Not only to all Prophets (by whom God spake at sundry times, and in diverse manners to the Fathers, Heb. 1. 1.) but to the Angels, nay to the Son of Man himself the greatest of Prophets, and the most Eminent Messenger he ever sent. But our Author pretends, "*That our Lord says, Whatever was not the Father was ignorant of that Day. Now he argues, That in no Nature, was the Son the Father.*"

(a) Here again he cites the Text wrong, for 'tis, Not the Son, but the Father.

Ans. Our Saviour saith no such thing, as That *whatever was not the Father, was ignorant of that Day:* Unless the *Author* means by *Whatever was not the Father*, the same as, *Whatever was a Being in Nature and Essence distinct from the Father.* And then I deny, That the Son of God is in no Nature, the same Being in respect of his Essence with the *Father.* So that all the *Author's* Argument turns upon this, That that Phrase *the Father only*, at *Matth.* 24. 36. must of Necessity exclude, not only all whom God employs as his *Messengers* to Men (which we freely grant) but even the *Eternal Word* and *Holy Spirit* (tho' the same in Nature and Essence with himself.) But this I deny, and shall shew him in an Instance or two the Absurdity of. I might urge *ad hominem* all those Passages where the *Unitarians* will not allow the word *Only*, to exclude all others except the Subject to which it is apply'd. Thus when *Solomon* saith of God, *Thou, even thou only, knowest the Hearts of the Children of Men;* our *Author* himself presumes to except our *Blessed Saviour*, tho' according to his Opinion only a dignify'd Creature. So when our *Saviour* saith, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,* *Matth.* 4. 10. the *Author*, I presume, will freely own, that *only* there does not exclude our *Blessed Saviour*, nor discharge us from our Obligation to serve him, tho' he be not in his Opinion the *God* there spoken of. But I shall chuse rather such Instances as are more unexceptionable. Thus, our *Saviour* saith, at *Matth.* 11. 27. *None knows the Son but the Father:* (For so *scias* shou'd be render'd.) But wou'd any wise Man from thence argue, *That none that is not the Father knows the Son*, and therefore, *the Son* (who is in no nature the *Father*) *does not know himself.* So at *John* 6. ver. 46. we read, *Not that any one οὐχ ὅτι τις hath seen the Father, save he that is of God, he hath seen the Father.* But will any Man thence conclude, *That the Father hath not seen* (or what is the same, *has not known*) *himself?*

To this the *Author* seems to reply, in what he adds under this Head,

“ *Will they say, That by the Father is meant all*
 “ *three Persons here, viz. Father, Son, and Holy*
 “ *Ghost? What, can the Father, as oppos'd to the Son,*
 “ *be put for the Father and the Son? What woful*
 “ *work will this make with Scripture, to suppose that*
 “ *what are oppos'd to each other, do include each other,*
 “ *under the very Characters by which they are oppos'd.*
 “ *As well may they say, That in the Baptismal Form,*
 “ *by the Father is meant Father, Son and Spirit, tho'*
 “ *he be distinguish'd from the other two. And I shou'd*
 “ *despair of ever understanding the Scriptures, above all*
 “ *Books that were ever written, at this rate of Inter-*
 “ *pretation. No doubt therefore but the Father as op-*
 “ *pos'd to the Son, excludes all that is the Son, and*
 “ *then there cou'd be no Son of God, that knew of*
 “ *that Day, which only the Father knew of, and*
 “ *consequently, No Son that is equal to God the Fa-*
 “ *ther.*

Ans. All this confident Reasoning is built on this Mistake that runs thro' the whole, That the *Father* is oppos'd to the *Son* on whatever account that Title is given to him. But I have shewn him the Context leads us plainly to expound it of the *Son of Man*. And if we so expound it, all his Argument is over-turn'd and lost. We understand by the *Father* the *First* of the Sacred *Three*, the Dispenser of all Divine Revelations, and not as he pretends, the *Father, Word, and Holy Spirit*. But we suppose the *Father* here oppos'd, not to the *Eternal Word* and *Holy Spirit*, that are *One* in Essence and Knowledge with himself. Not to the *Holy Spirit*, for he is elsewhere said to search the deep things of God, and to know 'em, as the *Spirit of a Man* does those of a *Man*, 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. Not to the *Eternal Word*, for he saith elsewhere, *All things that the Father has are mine, Therefore said I, he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you*, John 16. 15. The *Father* is therefore only oppos'd to all whom he employs as his *Messengers*, to *Prophets*, to *Angels*, to the *Son of Man* himself.

And

And now, let the *Author* apply this to his Argument. No doubt the *Father* as opposed to the *Son*, (i. e. to the *Son of Man*, as the Context expounds it) excludes all that is the *Son* (i. e. all that is the *Son of Man*.) But if he infer, Then there could be no *Son of God*, that knew of that *Day*, which the *Father* (as opposed to *Prophets*, *Angels*, and the *Son of Man*) knew of; Where is the Consequence? Or whence arises the mighty Difficulty of understanding this Passage according to our Interpretation, unless it be from his own violent Inclination to pervert it?

I come to his

3d Remark. "That Interpretation must needs be unjust, which if admitted, will make all, even the most plain Speech uncertain, and utterly insignificant: As this Interpretation of Christ's Words wou'd do. For I ask the Patrons of this Opinion, In what Words Jesus Christ cou'd in brief have denied himself to be God most High, if he had a mind to it, more plain and full than these, in which he saith, He knew not all things as the Father did, nor cou'd do all things, &c. So I would fain have 'em shew me, What Words of that nature he could have used, which the same way of Interpretation, as they here use, will not evade and make insignificant? For had he said and sworn in plain Words thus, viz. I tell you, I am not the Supreme God, and none but my Father has that Glory, they wou'd upon the same Reason have said, this was to be understood as Man only, &c. So that I may safely say thus much, That the Blessed Jesus has declar'd himself, not to be the Supreme God, or Equal to the Father, as plainly as Words could speak, or in brief express. And that this Declaration made by him already is not to be evaded, any other way, than what will make it impossible his Mind shou'd be declar'd by any Words he could have designedly used in the matter. Let any one try this, if it do not hold true. And sure it must be an absurd way of Interpretation, which leaves a Man no Opportunity or Power of Speaking his Mind plainly, so as to be understood.

Ans. I have recited this *Remark* at large, not so much for any Strength of Argument it contains, as to take this Occasion to remind the *Author* that more Humility would become him. For I do not altogether despair to make him sensible that his Confidence in this Paragraph is excessive, and beyond all due Measure of Sobriety and Modesty.

To this Purpose I must remind him that I have already shewn, that our *Blessed Saviour* does not disclaim the *Power of doing all things*, but on the contrary asserts it, when he saith, *That whatever things the Father does he does the same likewise*. And that he does not disclaim his *absolute Goodness* at all. And for this Passage that refers to his *Omniscience*, I have shewn him from the Context it amounts to no more than this, *That the Son of Man knew not of the Day of Judgment*. And now our *Author* asks the Patrons of this Opinion concerning the Deity of Christ, "*In what Words Jesus Christ could have deny'd himself to be the most High God, if he had a Mind to do it, more plain and full than these, and not to be evaded the same Way?*"

Ans. He might have done it most easily, had he said, *I am in no Sense whatever the Supreme God. I came of the Father according to the Flesh*, and am only a *Creature*, and no way *God over all, blessed for evermore*. I never created all things, nor have the Power in any Nature that belongs to me, of giving Being to the least Grain of Sand or Spire of Grass, much less to all things visible and invisible, &c. God indeed searches the Hearts and the Reins, but I can no Way do it, and know 'em only by Revelation from him, or by probable Conjecture. God may indeed display his Perfections in my human Nature, but I am not my self *God manifested in the Flesh*; nor does any of those divine Perfections belong to me, much less does the *Fulness of the Godhead dwell bodily in me*. I am only the *Word* as the Messenger of God, but never *was in the Beginning with God*, much less *was God*, or made any of his Works, being only a *Man and a Creature* like your selves. Since
you

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 105

you must worship and serve God only, you must by no Means give Worship and Homage to me, to whom no Respect is to be paid but what must be given to a dignify'd Creature, and infinitely differs from what must be given to such an infinite Being as God, to whose Excellency and Honour I never pretended: So that you must upon Peril of Idolatry beware of honouring me (even in my highest Capacity) as ye honour the Father. All those Passages of the Old Testament which speak concerning the God of Israel, if any of my Disciples apply 'em to me, must be understood by Way of *meer Accommodation*, and not as implying me to be indeed that *Blessed Jehovah* there spoken of. And now let the Author try his Skill, how he will evade all these Declarations against the true Deity of Christ the same Way that we evade this Text, that *no Man knows of that Day, or Hour, nor the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father?* We assert, that the Context expounds our Lord's Words concerning him as the *Son of Man*. But for Christ to say, *That the Son of Man knows not the Day of Judgment*, is no Denial at all of its being known to the *Eternal Word* to whom the Human Nature was united. But these Declarations I have laid down are not to be so evaded; and yet the Author is the more concern'd to make good his Challenge, because the Scriptures have asserted the quite contrary to the foregoing Declaration in the clearest and plainest Expressions; so that his Argument rather turns upon himself, and he will find himself harder put to it to shew us, in what plainer Words the *Supreme Deity* of Christ could have been deliver'd by the inspired Writers, than those I have now mention'd.

But our *Author* has not done. I therefore pass to his

4th Remark: "*This Way of Interpretation, (saith he) which they are necessitated to for upholding their Cause does plainly overthrow it, and may be turned against themselves. For it may be said, according to it, that Jesus is not God, without adding any more.*"

“ more. Nay, a Man may say his Creed backward;
 “ and since the Apostles Creed takes notice of nothing
 “ to be believ’d concerning Christ, but what belongs
 “ to his Manhood, (which is very strange, if there
 “ were any Articles relating to his Divinity, which
 “ must needs be most important) One may venture to
 “ deny ’em all with this secret Reserve, viz. Meaning
 “ it of the Divine Nature. So one may say, I believe
 “ not that Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy
 “ Ghost, &c.

Ans. The Reader must be put in mind, that our Author has proved nothing by just Construction, but that the Son of Man denies his knowing the Day of Judgment. But will it thence follow, that we may say, in Consistency with our Opinion, that Jesus Christ is not God? By no means: It will only follow, that we may safely say the Son of Man is not God. And under that Restriction no Christian thinks him to be so. So on the other Hand, it will not follow that we may say, Jesus Christ was not conceived of the Holy Ghost, nor born of the Virgin Mary, nor suffer’d under Pontius Pilate, &c. But only that we may say, the Eternal Word or the Divine Nature was not conceiv’d of the Holy Ghost, nor born of the Virgin Mary, &c. and under that Restriction the Assertion would be true. So that this Objection is not founded on our Way of interpreting the Texts which the Author refers to, but on his own Misrepresentation of it. But I must, before I dismiss this Remark, ask the Author, How he comes so confidently to assert, “ That the Apostles Creed takes notice of nothing to be believed concerning Christ, but what relates to his Manhood? Does he think the Compilers thought him no more than a Man, when they say, I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord? Has he answer’d either Dr. Barrow or Dr. Pierſon on the Creed, who undertake to prove, that the Scriptures give him that Title and Character on the Account of his Divine Nature? and who have shewn, that his being call’d the Son of God on other Accounts is common to him with others?

ners? And that so far as 'tis appropriated to him, by his being called his *only*, or *only-begotten Son*) it does as truly import his Participation of the Divine Nature, as his being call'd the *Son of Man* imports his Participation of the *Humane*? Or can he produce any of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, that understood that title to be the Description of no more than a *Dignify'd Creature*? Or has he answer'd what Dr. *Whitby* has produc'd to the contrary out of those *Fathers* (a)? Till he do this, one would think it would become him better to be a little more modest and wary in his Assertions. His last and

5th Remark is, "*It weighs something with me in Opposition to this Way of Interpretation, that the Evangelists never take Occasion (when they had so many) to subjoin any Caution against taking Christ's Words in their obvious Sense, when he saith, He did not know the Hour, &c. If our Lord had no Mind to reveal his Divinity, (tho' I see not why he should deny it thus) yet sure the Apostles, who wrote so many Years after, and whom it concerned to reveal all important Truths most clearly, would not have failed to set the Reader right, by removing such obvious Objections as these are against the Supreme Deity of Christ; and saying, that he spake this only of his Manhood, That he knew not all things, &c.*"

Ans. I have shewn him, that our Lord himself as in the Passage he so much insists on, sav'd his Apostles the Labour of adding such a Caution, by giving us the Caution himself. He has there in the Context describ'd himself as the *Son of Man* that shall come in the Clouds with great Glory, and said of himself under that Character, *That he knew not the Day and Hour* of that his glorious Appearance, but the Father, who has the Times and Seasons (of those glorious Events) in his own Power, Acts i. 7. And the

(a) See Dr. *Whitby's Tractatus de Deitate Christi*, p. 59, 60, 61, &c.

the like *Caution*, I have shewn him, our *Lord* has given against misunderstanding those Passages, which he makes use of against his *Omnipotence*, John 5. 19, 27, 30. So that what the *Author* suggests is most untrue, that our *Lord* in the Passages he has alledged, denies his Divinity. And had the *Author* carefully examin'd the *Context* in both Places, he might have found his own *Objections* obviated. But he seems to have been more intent on finding *Objections* against the Deity of Christ, than *Answers* to 'em, when he overlooks those that were so near at Hand, and cou'd scarce escape an inquisitive and humble Reader.

Upon the whole, I hope every judicious Christian will see, that these *Objections* against our Interpretation of the fore-cited Passages (tho' deliver'd in so magisterial a Strain, and in so insulting a Way) have much more of *Noise* and *Shew* than of any *Solidity* or *Strength* in 'em.

Having finish'd this Argument for the Deity of Christ, drawn from the *Divine Perfections* that are ascrib'd to him, and vindicated it from what the *Author* alledges to perswade us, that our *Lord* himself disclaims 'em; I now come to the

III^d, and last Argument for the Deity of our Blessed Saviour, drawn from that *Divine Worship* which the Scriptures require us to pay him.

As to this Head, the *Author* tells us, "He doubts not he could maintain his Cause with equal Advantage. And accordingly he suggests a few Arguments to shew, "That there is no Instance of supreme Divine Worship given ultimately to him in Scripture; but on the contrary, all the Honour it assigns to him, is such as speaks him to be inferior to the Father, and dependent on him.

I shall therefore, in Vindication of this Argument for the Deity of Christ from the Worship due to him, First, briefly state the Notion of *Divine Worship*. Secondly, Shew that the Scriptures require us to pay such *Divine Worship* to our Blessed Saviour. Thirdly, Consider what *Worship* our Aversaries

ries, and particularly the *Author*, seem to allow him: And here I shall both consider what he objects against our giving *Divine Worship* to him; and shew also, how evidently that *Worship* he allows him encroaches on the Divine Honour, upon the Supposition of his being only a dignify'd Creature.

First, I shall briefly state the Notion of *Divine Worship*.

Now since *Worship* in general imports the *Respect* we pay to another on the Account of his *Excellency* and *Superiority*, *Divine Worship* must import such *Respect* as belongs to a *Being* of such infinite *Excellencies* and *Supreme Authority* as the *Blessed God* alone is posselt of.

And such *Worship* is either *Internal*, consisting in those Acts of our Mind (such as Esteem, Reverence, Love, Trust, Subjection, Self-Dedication) whereby we acknowledge such *Infinite Excellencies*, and *Supreme Authority* to belong to the *Being* we adore; or *External*, and this is partly express'd by our *Words*, in our *Prayers*, *Praises*, &c. partly by our *Gestures*, as *Kneeling*, *Standing*, *Bowing*, *Prostration*, &c.

Now such *Worship*, whether *Internal* or *External*, as does in the Nature of the Acts themselves, or by reasonable Construction, imply the *Being* we offer it to, to be possess'd of the *Perfections* and *Authority* peculiar to the *Blessed God*, is *Divine Worship*.

I come therefore,

Secondly, To shew, That the *Holy Scriptures* require us to pay such *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*.

To make good this Assertion, I shall briefly set before the Reader those Passages that require us to pay *Divine Worship* in general to our *Blessed Lord*, or to offer to him this or that particular Branch of it.

For *Divine Worship* in general, all do agree that the Honour due to the *Father* is *Divine Worship*. But this Honour the *Son of God* challenges as due to him, at *John* 5. 23. What the *Author* objects against this I shall consider in its due place.

Again,

Again, *Divine Worship* is in general express'd throughout the Scripture by our *Calling on the Name of the Lord*. Now we are not only expressly requir'd to pay this Homage to our *Blessed Saviour*, but it's made the Condition of our Salvation by him. To clear this we need only carefully compare *Joel* 2. 32. with *Rom.* 10. 11, 12, 13, &c. The Prophet *Joel* speaking of the times of the *Messiah* concludes his Prediction with that gracious Promise, *And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved*. Now the Apostle *Paul* urging the Jews to believe on and confess the Lord *Jesus* in order to Salvation, cites two Passages to enforce his Exhortation; the one from *Isa.* 28. 11. *Whosoever believes on him shall not be ashamed*; the other from *Joel* 2. 32. *That whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be sav'd*. And that none of what Nation soever might think themselves excluded from this gracious Promise, he pre-mises this encouraging Consideration, *That there is now no Difference between Jew and Greek, but the same Lord over all is rich to all that call upon him*, ver. 12. Now that 'tis the Lord *Jesus* whom he here exhorts us to believe in and call upon in order to Salvation, is evident not only from the whole Scope of the Chapter and Context, but particularly from the 14th Verse, *How then shall they call on him on whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* &c. In whom they were to believe as Preach'd to 'em, on him they were to call. But they were to believe in our *Blessed Saviour*: He therefore is the Lord over all that is rich to all that call on him. And of him the Prophet *Joel* spake when he said, *Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be sav'd*. But all grant that *Joel* spake of the true God, and of that truly *Divine Worship* which is his incommunicable Glory. That *Divine Worship* therefore must be given to our *Blessed Saviour* by such as expect Salvation from him.

And

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. III

And thus to *worship our Blessed Saviour by Religious Invocation* is so necessary and important a Duty, that 'tis made by the Apostle *Paul* the essential Character and Mark of a true Christian. He directs his Epistle at *1 Cor. 1. 2.* To the Church that is at *Corinth*, To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, call'd to be Saints, *with all that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.* And to the same purpose, 'tis observable, that the Professors of Christianity were known by this Description of 'em, they were such as *call'd on the Name of our Lord Jesus, Acts 9. 14, 21.* I know indeed some late Unitarians have pretended, that these Expressions may be render'd, Such as are called by the Name of the Lord. But this Criticism is so fully confuted by Dr. *Whitby*, both in his English Commentary on the Epistles, and especially in his Latin Treatise *de Deitate Christi*, p. 16, 17. by shewing that the Phrase is throughout both the *Septuagint* and the *New Testament* taken actively, and is varied whenever any are said to be *call'd by the Name of another*, that I presume we shall hear no more of it. (a.) And this one Passage at *Rom. 10. 11, 12, 13.* is sufficient to put the Meaning of the Phrase past Dispute, especially if compar'd with *Acts 7. 59.* and with *Acts 15. 17.*

And what I have said concerning *Divine Worship in general*, may be applied to the particular *Acts* of it.

As to *Acts of Internal Worship.* Are we obliged to make the *Father* the Object of our Faith and Trust? So must we believe in our Lord Jesus, as well as Call upon him, *Rom 10. 14.* And he himself requires it, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me, John 14. 1.* Are we required to Love God above all? So must we love our Lord Jesus more than Father or Mother, Brother

(a) The Reader that understands the Greek Tongue may consult the *Septuagint* in the following Places: *1 Kings 8. 43. 1s. 4. 1. 1s. 68. 19. Jer. 14. 19. Jer. 15. 16. Dan. 9. 18. 19, &c.*

or Sister, House or Lands, yea, than Life it self, Matth. 10. 37. Luke 14. 26. So that if any Man love him not, let him (saith the Apostle Paul) be *Anathema Maranatha*, 1 Cor. 16. 22. Are we requir'd to subject our Wills to the Authority of God? So must we be the *Servants of Christ*, we must take his *Yoke on us*, and do his Will, Matth. 11. 29. Col. 3. 24. Are we to live to God, as our ultimate End? So must we live not to our selves, but to him that died for us, and rose again, 2 Cor. 5. 15. The Advancement of his Glory and Interest must be our principal Aim and Design. Are we to dedicate our selves by solemn Covenant to the Faith and Worship of the *Father*? So must we to that of the *Son* and the *Holy Spirit*, Matth. 28. 19. (Of which more afterwards). And sure we cannot conceive any more essential and important *Acts of Divine Worship* than these.

And for *External Worship*, we may observe, That the several Branches of it are due to our *Blessed Saviour*.

One eminent Branch of it is *Praise and Thanksgiving*. And sure I need not tell any true Christian that this part of *Divine Homage* must be paid to our *Blessed Saviour*. How frequently do such *Doxologies* occur in the New Testament? To him (saith the Apostle Peter, speaking of our Lord Jesus, 1 Pet. 3. 11.) be *Glory both now and for ever, Amen*. So 1 Pet. 4. 11. *To whom be Praise and Dominion for ever*. So Rev. 1. 5, 6. *To him that has loved us, and wash'd us from our Sins in his own Blood, and made us Kings and Priests to God and his Father, to him be Glory and Dominion for ever*. And 'tis manifest that these *Doxologies* are parallel to those that are elsewhere offered to the *Father*. See 1 Pet. 5. 10, 11. 1 Tim. 1. 17. and 6. 16. So that if these very *Doxologies* are manifestly *Acts of Divine Worship*, when used towards the *Father*, we have no reason to take 'em for any other, when offer'd to our *Blessed Saviour*: Especially when we find both of 'em join'd in the very same *Doxology*, and have the same *Blessing, and Honour, and Glory*,
and

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 113

and Power ascrib'd to 'em. And yet this all Creatures whatever are oblig'd to ascribe to him that sits upon the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever, Rev. 5. 13. And again, all the Members of the Church Triumphant, with concordant Heart and Voice, ascribe Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb; Rev. 7. 10. And that the Lamb must be there understood of the Incarnate Son of God, and not of a meer dignify'd Man, is evident, because he is exempted from the Rank of Creatures, which are all requir'd to pay this Homage to him; and that on the Account of his having in our Nature been slain, and thereby redeeming us to God by his Blood, from every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation. Now if such *Doxologies* as these, when used to our Blessed Saviour, be not *Acts of Divine Worship*; if the same *Glory*, and *Praise*, and *Dominion*, be not thereby ascribed to him as to the Father, they must be used in so vastly different a Sense, when apply'd to him; from what is meant when they are apply'd to the Father, that we cannot think it consistent with the Wisdom and Sincerity of an inspired Writer to use them promiscuously towards both, without giving us any Distinction in what a different Sense they are intended, when apply'd to the one, and to the other: Nay, without giving us any Caution against the Idolatry we are in danger of incurring, by addressing our selves to both in the same Language, if we put not a vastly different Construction on the very same Words; when us'd in our Addresses to the one or the other. For there is such an infinite Disproportion between the Blessed God, and the most dignify'd Creature, that our religious Respect to the one and the other can never be fitly paid at the same time, in the same Language, and the same External Acts of Devotion. The like *Glory* and *Dominion* can never be congruously ascribed to both. Our Language to 'em ought to put the utmost Difference that Words can make between the Eternal infinite Excellencies and supreme Dominion of the one, and the finite Excellencies, and meerly borrow'd Power of the other. But there is no such

Distinction made, when we use the very same *Doxologies* to our *Blessed Saviour* as we use to the *Father*.

Again, For *Prayer*, We are requir'd to address this branch of *Divine Worship* to our *Lord Jesus*. This is particularly included in our *Calling on his Name*. And we have several Instances of the Practice of Christians being conformable to this part of their Character, That they were such as *call'd upon his Name*. 'Tis the common Form of the Apostolical Salutations to *wish Grace and Peace to those to whom they write, From the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ* (a). And sometimes they wish the *Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ may be with 'em* (without any express mention of the *Father* (b)). It was to our *Lord Jesus* that the Apostle thrice pray'd, *That the Thorn in the Flesh might depart from him*, as appears by the *Answer* given him, 2 Cor. 12. 8, 9. Nor ought we to forget the Prayer of dying *Stephen*, the first Martyr for the Christian Cause, whose dying Request to our *Blessed Lord* bears a noble Testimony to this Truth, That this part of Divine Worship is due to him. *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit, and Lord lay not this Sin to their Charge*, Acts 7. 59, 60. In which two *Petitions* he has manifestly express his Faith in our *Lord Jesus*, as both able to forgive the Sin of his Enemies, and to reward and crown his own persevering Fidelity. Nay what greater Testimony can we have to this, than the Petition address'd to our *Lord* by his whole *Church*, with which the Sacred Canon is concluded, Rev. 27. 17, 20, 21. I shall only add, That sometimes we find the *Father* and our *Lord Jesus* join'd in the same particular Petition offer'd to 'em; as 1 Thess. 3. 11, 12. 2 Thess. 2. 16, 17. Sometimes the Apostles begs such Blessings from our *Saviour* alone, 2 Thess. 3. 16, 18. Gal. 6. 11. Phil. 9. 23.

(a) Rom. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 1. 3.

(b) Rom. 16. 24. 1 Cor. 16. 23, &c.

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 115

And as our *Praises* and *Prayers* are to be address'd to him, so in those two *Fæderal Rites* of our Holy Religion, those two *Sacraments* of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, we are oblig'd to pay *Divine Homage* to him.

In the *Former* (viz. *Baptism*) we are as solemnly baptiz'd into his *Name* as that of the *Father*. And if our being baptiz'd into the *Father's Name* signify our *Solemn Dedication to the Faith and Worship and Service of the Father*: (As the Christian Church has in all Ages understood this to be the import of it :) Then our Being *Baptized into the Name of the Son and Holy Spirit*, must imply the like *Dedication to them*. For had our *Lord* intended no more by this Form of *Baptism*, than our being oblig'd to profess the Religion which the *Father* (who alone is *God*) has reveal'd by the *Son* (who is only a *Man*) and confirm'd by his *Power of working Miracles*, which they suppose here call'd the *Holy Spirit*, how very *easy* would it have been to express the matter thus? And how *needful* was it to prevent so pernicious an Error, as the words (according to their Opinion) naturally leads us into, of taking those *three* into whose *Names* we are *distinctly Baptiz'd* to be that *One God*, to whose *Faith* and *Service* we are in that solemn Institution devoted? Nay how unreasonable does it appear, not only that we shou'd be thus *Baptiz'd jointly into the name of God and of a Creature*, but *into the Name of Miracles*, or of the *Divine Power* that wrought 'em? Why might we not as well be *Baptiz'd into the Name of God's Wisdom or Truth or Goodness*, which are as illustriously display'd in the Gospel of Christ, as into the *Name of his Power*? Nor can this harsh and forced Exposition of the Form of *Baptism* be justify'd from the *Israelites* being said to be *Baptiz'd into Moses*. If indeed they cou'd produce us some such *Form* as this, by which the *Israelites* were in the same *fæderal Rite*, *Baptiz'd into the Name of God and the Name of Moses*, this wou'd give some countenance to their Interpretation. 'Till then, we must tell 'em, being *Baptiz'd*

into *Moses*, is not the same thing with being *Baptized into his Name*, and much less in Conjunction with that of the *Father* and the *Holy Spirit*, and that in the highest and most important act of Devotion imaginable.

And for the *Lord's-Supper*, we know 'tis the principal Design of it to honour our *Blessed Saviour* by a grateful Commemoration of his dying Love, by the exercise of a lively Faith in him, by a renewed Dedication of our selves to him as our Lord-Redeemer, and by a publick Ascription of endless Glory and Dominion to him in Conjunction with the *Father*. So that our *Blessed Lord Jesus* is most eminently the Object of that *Homage* and *Devotion* which this Holy Institution calls for. And can any serious Christian doubt whether the Celebration of it be an *Act of Divine Worship*? It was probable in the primitive Church one stated part of the Worship of every Lord's-Day, and was always accounted as truly a part of the *Divine Worship* they celebrated, as any other act of Devotion whatsoever.

And for *External Acts of Worship*, we are as sure that our *Blessed Lord* did upon all occasions receive 'em without the least check or caution to those that gave 'em. He said not to those that fell at his Feet and worship'd him, as the Apostle *Peter* did to *Cornelius*, *Stand up, for my self also am a Man*, *Acts* 10. 25, 26. Or as the *Angel* to *St. John*; *See thou do it not. Worship God*, *Rev.* 19. 10. 22. 9. Tho' many did thus Worship him not only during his Life, but his Disciples did it joyntly after his *Resurrection*, and upon his *Ascension*. See *Mat.* 23. 17. *Luke* 24. 52. And if any shou'd pretend, That our *Lord* did not reprove these Worshippers, because they intended only to pay him the Respect due to an *Eminent Prophet*, but not the Worship due to *God*, yet sure according to their Opinion, our *Lord* ought in all reason to have reprov'd and caution'd *Thomas* against the Excess of his Devotion, when in such a Rapture of Zeal he cry'd out to him, *My Lord and My God*, *John* 20. 28. But our Saviour is so far from censuring his
Devo-

Devotion as irregular and excessive, that on the contrary he approves and commends his Faith at *ver. 29.*

And sure I need not go about to prove, That to give such *Divine Worship* to our Lord *Jesus* was the Universal Practice of the Christian Church in its first and purest Ages, as well as in all succeeding Ones. Insomuch as those of the *third Age* insist upon this as one great Argument to prove, That the *Deity of Christ* was the Belief of the *two foregoing*, viz. That our Lord *Jesus* had always been the Object of the Worship of the Christian Church, even while they openly profess'd to *Worship God alone.*

And no wonder, that our Lord *Jesus* shou'd be the Object of the Worship of the *Christian Church*, when the *Angels of God* (that Heavenly Host) are requir'd to pay the like Homage to him. For so we are told by the *Inspired Writer* to the *Hebrews*, *Heb. 1. 6. When God brought his only begotten Son into the World, he said, Let all the Angels of God Worship him.* And for those *Unitarian Writers*, that tell us, This passage is cited from *Pf. 97. 7.* which is no way intended by the *Psalmist* concerning *Christ*, but used by him wholly on another occasion; they do in effect tell us, That according to their Judgment, the *Inspired Writer* mistook the Sense of 'em, and quoted 'em when they were no way for his purpose; and for those of their Writers that tell us, This Passage is not taken out of the *Psalms*, but out of *Deut. 32. 43.* where the *Septuagint* has these Words, *Let all the Angels of God Worship him*; and that this Passage refers only to *Israel*, the meaning of it being only this, *Let all the Angels of God minister for the good of his People Israel*, I shall only observe, that if this be true, then this Passage is quite impertinent to the scope of the *Inspired Writer*. For if *Worshipping* one be only *Ministring to him* (as it must be if the *Angels* are said to *Worship Israel*) then it can no way infer the Superiority of *Christ* above *Angels*, that they are required to *worship him* in this Sense, i. e. to *Minister to him.* *Angels* thus *minister to us*, who are Heirs of Salvation: But this no ways proves

our Superiority to 'em; Much less wou'd it justify any one's saying, that they are oblig'd to *Worship us*.

And as the Holy Scriptures thus require us to pay *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*, so they ascribe to him those *Divine Perfections* and that *supreme Dominion* that are the solid ground of it.

One ground of *Divine Worship* results from the *Transcendent Perfections* of the great object of it, such as his *Omnipresence*, his *Omniscience*, his *boundless Goodness* and *Almighty Power*: Now these are in the Scriptures ascrib'd to our *Blessed Lord*. He is represented as *present* in all Christian Assemblies, *Even where two or three are gathered together in his Name*, *He is in the midst of 'em*, Matth. 18. 20. He is represented as *taking up his Abode* in the Soul of every sincere Christian, *John* 14. 23. He is described as *Knowing all things*, nay as *Searching the very Hearts and the Reins* of every particular Member that belongs to his Church, *John* 21. 17. *Rev.* 2. 23. He is represented as *doing whatever things the Father does*, as *able by his mighty working to subdue all things to himself*. He is described, *As the Lord over all, who is rich unto all that call upon him*, Rom. 10. 12. Nay the *Riches* of his *Goodness* are *Unsearchable*, and in him all fulness dwells, even all the fulness of the *Godhead*, that of his fulness we may receive *Grace* for *Grace*, *Ephes.* 3. 8. *Col.* 1. 19. *John* 1. 16.

Another ground of *Divine Worship* is God's *Supreme Dominion*. And as that is founded both on the *Right of Creation* and *Continual Preservation*, and the superadded *Right of Redemption*; so the Holy Scriptures ascribe to our *Blessed Lord* a *Sovereign Dominion* founded on both these Titles. To him they attribute, as I have already proved, both the *Making* and the *Upholding of all things*. And to prove, that they attribute the glorious Work of *Redemption* to him, were to transcribe a considerable part of the New Testament.

I have the more largely insisted on this Head, both to shew, That we are far from going upon flight
and

and rash Grounds in that *Divine Worship* we give to our *Blessed Saviour*, having the whole Current of the New Testament on our side, as well as the Universal Practice of the Christian Church; and to convince every serious Christian Reader, that this Controversy is not about a meer Speculative Point, in which practical Religion is little concerned, but about a Truth of great Moment and Consequence, the Denial whereof is highly injurious to the Honour of our *Blessed Saviour*, by taking away the only solid Ground of that *Divine Homage and Devotion* we pay to him. But it leads me to the next Head I propos'd, viz.

Thirdly, To consider what Worship our *Adversaries*, and particularly the *Author*, do allow him; and upon what grounds they do so.

Now as to this Point of the *Worship* due to our *Blessed Saviour*, the Opposers of his Deity are greatly divided among themselves.

It was this that occasion'd so sharp Disputes between *Socinus* on the one Hand, and *Franciscus Davidis* and *Christianus Franken* on the other.

Socinus thought all those Passages of Scripture which mention the *Invocation of Christ*, and ascribe such an *Universal Authority and Power* to him (*i. e.* that make him a *God by Office or Deputation*) were sufficient Warrant for giving him *Divine Worship*. And accordingly *Socinus* speaks of the Opinion of those that denied *Divine Worship* to our Saviour as a most filthy and pernicious Error, that led to *Judaism*, and was in effect, *The Denying of Christ*, and tending to *Epicurism and Atheism*. Nay he goes so far as to tell us, *he never knew any good and pious Man of that Opinion* (a). *Smalcus* reproaches 'em as *Persons of little Understanding, and pufft up with a Jewish Spirit*. (b). Nay elsewhere saith *They are no Christians*. *Niemoje-vius* censures them as *ignorant of Christ, who had ne-*

(a) Socin. Op. Tom. 2. p. 773.

(b) Smalcus de Divin. J. Christi, cap. 24.

ver tasted how good and kind the Lord is: Nay tells us, They are Pseudo-Christians or Lukewarm Ones, not built on Christ as lively Stones (c). Volkelius largely proves such Divine Worship to be due to him (d). And Wolzogenius asserts, It may be justly said, That they do not honour the Father, who deny the Divine Honour of Adoration to Christ as he is Man: For we have (saith he) demonstrated that Divine Worship which is due to the Father, is also due to Christ (e).

On the other Hand, Franciscus Davidis, Christianus Franken, Glirius and others deny'd that any such Divine Worship shou'd be given to him, being plainly inconsistent with the first Commandment, and highly injurious to the Honour of God.

Now let us consider, What our late Unitarians think of this Dispute, and what their own Sentiments and Practice are in reference to it.

They do indeed tell us, " Some Worship is due to the Lord Christ. And therefore they distinguish between Civil Worship, due from Men to one another: Religious Worship, given on the account of a Person's Holiness or Relation to God, which as to the degree may be more or lesser, as their Sanctity or Relation to God is greater or lesser; and this sort of Worship (they tell us) is due to Holy Men and Women, to the Ministers of God, yet more to Prophets, and above them to glorify'd Angels and Saints: And Divine Worship, which belongs only to God. And this (they tell us) consists in Resigning our Understanding to whatever he reveals, (And O that they wou'd more conscientiously pay this part of Worship due to him!) and in Resigning our Wills and Desires to what he decrees and does, and in giving up our Affections to love him above all. It consists moreover in such External Acts and Significations of Reverence and Love, as we reserve only for him, and never give to any other.

(c) Socin. Op. Tom. 1. p. 398. and Tom. 2. p. 466.

(d) Volkelius de vera Relig. l. 5. cap. 29.

(e) Wolzog. in Matth. 4. 10. Joh. 5. 23, 24.

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 121

Accordingly they tell us, "*No Texts of Scripture prove, That the Lord Christ ought to be worship'd with more than a Civil, or Religious Worship. And there are no Acts of Worship requir'd to be paid to him, but such as may be paid to a Civil Power, to a Person in high Dignity and Office, or to Prophets and holy Men, or to such as are actually possess'd of the heavenly Beatitudes. See 2d Collect. of Tract. Answ. to Mr. Milb. 49, 50.*"

And the same *Writer* relating the Dispute between *Socinus* and his *Opponents*, mentions the *Answers* his *Opponents* gave to his *Arguments*, without offering any Reply to 'em. On the contrary, he endeavours to shew, That *Socinus's* Opinion about *praying to Christ* was inconsistent with his *Office as Mediator*. But yet he endeavours to clear it from the Charge of *Idolatry*, because he supposes they may pray to *Christ*, without ascribing *Omniscience* or *Omnipotency* to him. And upon the whole he supposes they should in this Difference bear with one another's Opinion and Practice.

To the same Purpose, *The Author of the Letter concerning the Unitarians*, blames the *Polonian Unitarians* or *Socinians*, who excommunicated and depos'd from their Ministry such of their own Party, as deny'd that *Christ might be Pray'd to, or Worship'd with Divine Worship*. And he commends the Moderation of the *Transylvanian Unitarians*, who admitted to the Ministry and to Professors Places, such as rejected the *Invocation and Adoration of Christ*, only obliging 'em under their Hands, that they should not openly oppose it in their Sermons and Lectures. And accordingly he alledges their Arguments against Worshipping our Saviour, and answers some of the Texts alledg'd by others.

And whereas the late *Archbishop Tillotson* had insisted on this Argument for the *Deity of Christ* drawn from the *Divine Worship* due to him, His *Answerer* tells us roundly, "*They have wrote no Books these last seven Years, in which they have not been careful to profess to all the World, That a like*"
"Ho-

“ Honour and Worship (much less the same) is
 “ not to be given to Christ, as must be given to
 “ God.

So that upon the whole, we may justly place our present *Unitarians* among those that deny *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*, and that allow him no other *Worship* than what (as themselves tell us) may be paid to a *Person in high Dignity and Office*, to *Prophets*, or *holy Men*, or *such as are actually possess'd of the heavenly Beatitudes*, (i. e. to glorify'd Saints).

As to our *Author* he does not seem at first View so very clear in delivering his Sentiments about it as might be expected. He saith indeed, “ *There is no*
 “ *Instance of Supreme Divine Worship given ultimately*
 “ *to Christ in Scripture*. And so far the *Socinians* themselves will agree with him. For tho' they assert, that truly *Divine Worship* must be paid him, yet they allow not *him*, but only the *Father*, to be the *ultimate Object* of it: And say, that the *Divine Worship* paid to him does finally redound to the *Glory of the Father*, who has admitted him to a *Participation* of his own *Honour*. And yet there are other Expressions which seem to import, that our *Author* entirely falls in with those late *Unitarians*, who deny any *Divine Worship* to be due to our *Blessed Saviour*. For he tells us, “ *The Worship paid to him being*
 “ *grounded upon derived and borrowed Excellency, is*
 “ *not supremely Divine, and cannot be offer'd to the*
 “ *Infinite, Self-Originate, Independent Deity, without*
 “ *a great Affront, because 'tis not the most Excellent*. From whence I think we may safely conclude, that our *Author* does not allow *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*. For sure it were most absurd to call that *Worship Divine*, which we cannot offer to the *Blessed God* without *affronting him*, and (as our *Author* adds) *without mingling Reproach with Praise*.

I shall therefore in order to the bringing the Debate of this Argument to an Issue,

I. Consider what the *Author* has offer'd against our giving *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*.

II. Examine the *Grounds* our *Adversaries* go upon in the *Worship* they allow to our *Blessed Saviour*.

I. I shall consider what the *Author* has offer'd against our giving *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*.

And the great Argument he insists on is, "*Because the Worship given to him is grounded on derived and borrowed Excellency, which therefore is not supremely Divine, nor can be offer'd to the Infinite, Self-originate, Independent Deity, without a great Affront, as not being the most Excellent, Mal. i. 14. To praise an Independent God for Honour and Power granted to him by another, supposes a Falshood, and mingles Reproaches with Praise.*"

Ans. If the *Author* mean by derived and borrowed Excellency, such Excellency as the Supreme God communicates to a *Dignify'd Creature*, I deny that the *Worship* which the *Scriptures* require us to pay to *Christ* is grounded upon any such derived or borrowed Excellency. 'Tis founded, as I have shewn, on the *Divine Perfections* that are ascrib'd to him, and on that *Right of Creation* and *Redemption* that can belong to no meer *Creature* how dignify'd soever.

So if our *Author* mean by *Power granted to our Saviour by another*, any *Strength*, or *Might*, or *Authority* which does not originally belong to any *Divine Nature* our Lord is possess'd of, and is only borrow'd on him as a *dignify'd Creature* by God as his *Creator*, I deny that the *Scriptures* assign any such Ground of the *Worship* they require us to give to our *Blessed Lord*.

And accordingly, I shall carefully examine what our *Author* has alledg'd to prove what he asserts, that the *Worship* given to him in *Scripture* is grounded on such derived or borrowed Excellency, &c.

To this Purpose he argues:

"Thus our Lord requires *Baptism* (if that be an Act of immediate proper *Worship*) in his Name, because All Power in Heaven and Earth is committed to him.

Ans.

Anfw. I cannot well understand why our *Author* should make a Doubt of *Baptism's* being an *Act* of immediate proper Worship. Did any Christian before him ever doubt of its being a Sacred Rite, by which the Person baptiz'd is solemnly dedicated to that Blessed God, into whose Name he is baptiz'd? And is not such a *Dedication* the highest and most solemn Act of Devotion that a *Creature* can pay to its absolute *Owner* and *Lord*? So that I cannot see why our *Author* should question it, unless he be afraid, that the granting it will strengthen the Argument we draw from thence for the paying the same *Divine Worship* to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, as we pay to the *Father*. But the *Author* tells us, "That *Christ* therefore requires *Baptism* in his Name, because all Power in Heaven and Earth is given him."

Anfw. Our Blessed Lord alledges *all Power* in Heaven and Earth being given him, as the Ground of his sending out his Apostles to go and disciple all Nations, to whose Faith and Obedience he had a just Claim. And when he saith, *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to me*, he does not mean (as our *Author* supposes) that he had no such *Original Power* or *Authority* over Earth and Heaven belonging to himself: For it did always belong to that *Divine Nature* he is possess'd of, and is the inseparable Result of that *Work of Creation*, which I have shewn, that the Scriptures ascribe to him. But that the sole Exercise of this Power is now devolv'd into his Hand, and that he in the *Quality of Mediator* is the sole Administrator of the *Divine Kingdom*; this is the *Father's* voluntary Gift, and this our *Lord* intends, when he saith, *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to me*. But this does by no means imply, that the *Worship* of our *Lord* is founded on such a borrow'd Power as may be communicated to a dignified Creature: But on the contrary, that 'tis founded on the *Authority* that originally belongs to the *Divine Nature* of our *Blessed Saviour*, tho' the sole Exercise of it be by a voluntary Dispensation

committed to him. Even among Men, two or more may be possess'd of the same supreme Authority, and yet the sole Administration be in the Hands of one. We had an Instance of this in a late Reign, when the Crown was settled on that illustrious Pair King *William* and Queen *Mary*, and yet the sole Administration was in the King's Hands. This is some Illustration of what I am here asserting, that tho' the *Father* and the *Son* are possess'd of the same *Authority*, yet the sole Administration of the Divine Kingdom, during this present State of Things, may be by the *Father's* Consent in the Hands of the *Son*. I know indeed, that we must not strain such Comparisons in our Application, so as to conceive of the *Father* and the *Son* as two distinct and separate Beings. But yet as their Participation of the same Divine Nature does not take away that Difference and Distinction between 'em, which is more than nominal, so such Examples may help us to conceive the more easily of such a *voluntary Dispensation*.

Again, Our *Author* argues;

"Thus we must honour the Son, (as truly, not as greatly) as we honour the Father, because the Father hath committed or given all Judgment to him, *John* 5. 22, 23.

Ans. The Text saith, *That we must honour the Son as we honour the Father.* And these Words (as truly but not as greatly) are only the *Author's* presumptuous and groundless Addition. *Socinus* his Followers did from these very Words justly conclude, that *Divine Worship must be given to our Saviour*. For to give him only an *inferior Religious Respect*, such as we may give to a *Prophet*, or to a *glorify'd Saint*, or a *most dignify'd Creature*, is not to honour him as we honour the Father at all. For to offer such Honour to the Father were to offer him the highest Indignity and Affront, and to Reproach instead of Praising him, as the *Author* well observes: So that we cannot honour him as we honour the Father, without giving him the same kind of Worship. And the Reason of

our

our thus *Honouring the Son* which is there assign'd viz. *Because the Father judges no Man, but has committed all Judgment to the Son*, is so far from implying, That we must not give him the same Honour or *Worship* as we give the *Father*, that it implies the quite contrary. For because the Divine Government is in his Hands, so that he is the final Judge of all, and the sole Arbiter of our Eternal Happiness or Misery; therefore truly *Divine Honour* is due to him. And that this *Judgment is committed to him*, does not import, as I have already suggested, That the *Right of Judging the World* did not originally belong to that Divine Nature he is possess'd of; but only, that the *Sole Exercise* of it being in his Hands, is the Result of a *voluntary Dispensation*. And by the way I may observe, in Confirmation of this *Exposition*, That tho' the *Man Christ Jesus* shall be employ'd in judging the World, yet the Scriptures do also ascribe it to God, and assert, That the *Lord himself will be Judge*, That every *Knee shall bow to him*, That before him all the *Dead, small and great, shall stand*: And yet we are expressly told, *The Father judges no Man, but has committed all Judgment to the Son*: So that God judges the World, when the Son judges it. Nay 'tis observable, That the Apostle Paul proves, That we shall all stand before the *Judgment-Seat of Christ*, from these Words of the Prophet, *Isa. 45. 23. As I live (saith the Lord) every Knee shall bow to me, and every Tongue shall confess to God*. Now if the Apostle's Reasoning be just, our Saviour must be that *Jehovah*, and that *God*, before whom the Prophet had foretold that every *Knee shou'd bow*: For otherwise it wou'd no way follow, that because every *Knee shou'd bow to God*, that we must therefore all stand before the *Judgment-Seat of Christ*. So that without supposing him to be God, we must suppose the Apostle to alledge that as a Proof of his Assertion, from whence it cou'd be no way justly infer'd.

Again, the *Author* argues, " Thus at the Name of
 " *Jesus* must every *Knee bow*, and every *Tongue confess*
 " him to be *Lord*, because as a Reward of his Obedience
 " God

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 127

God has given him a Name above every Name; and 'tis added, That all this Homage is ultimately to the Glory of the Father.

Answ. To make this Argument of any Force against Giving Divine Worship to our Blessed Saviour, the Author must prove, That this Text speaks only of such a Dominion as belongs to Christ, as a meer signify'd Creature, and makes that the sole Foundation of the Worship that is to be given him. But this I deny. On the contrary, *That every Knee shou'd bow, and every Tongue confess to him*, proves him to be that very God whom the Prophet *Esay* speaks of in the precited Place, 45. 23. And indeed the former Verse plainly appropriates that Honour to the true God. *Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the Earth, for I am God, and there is none else, I have sworn by my self, &c. That to me every Knee shall bow, &c.* See v. 22, 23. And yet that the sole Exercise of the Divine Dominion, and an Authority over Angels themselves shou'd be committed to the Incarnate Son of God as Mediator, is the Gift of the Father, and the Reward of that Obedience that our Saviour had paid in his Humane Nature. And our Acknowledgment and Subjection to that Dominion does redound to the Glory of the Father, whose Good-pleasure it was to reward the transcendent Love of the Son to us, by this Constitution, *That he the Father shou'd judge no Man, but all Judgment should be committed to the Son.*

But the Author adds, " So that however there may be the same common External Acts or Words, (such as bowing the Knee, and saying Glory and Praise, &c.) used to God and the Mediator; As also in some Instances, they are given in common to ordinary Men; Yet the Mind of a rational Worshipper will make a Distinction in his inward Intention, as no doubt but those devout Jews did, who in the same Act bowed their Heads, and worshipped both God and the King, 1 Chron. 29. 20.

Answ. For External Acts, such as Bowing, Kneeling, no doubt we may use 'em to express either Civil

or

or *Religious Worship*. And therefore the *Jews* might both *bow to God*, and after that turn and *bow to the King*, the one to express their *Religious Homage*, the other their meer *Civil Obeysance*. (For that they express'd both at once by the same individual Act of Bowing is more than the Text asserts). And here, there was no Danger of any one's mistaking this Respect paid to the King for any other than *Civil Homage*. The visible Difference of the *Objects* does in this case sufficiently distinguish the Nature of the *External Acts*. But for *Words*, and particularly such as the *Author* refers to, the saying, *All Glory and Praise, or all Glory and Dominion be ascribed to such a One for ever*, we wou'd gladly see, what Instances the *Author* can give us in Scripture of such *Doxologies* being ever applied to *ordinary Men*, nay or the *highest Angel*, or the *most dignify'd Creature* whatever. And much less can he give us one Instance in which *God*, and such a *Dignify'd Creature*, are join'd together. Nay, for such *External Acts* as Bowing or Prostration, we may observe with what extraordinary Caution both *Good Men* and *Good Angels* refus'd 'em, when they seem'd to be given on any *Religious Account*; tho' they knew that those who offer'd em, never intended 'em as Acts of strictly *Divine Worship*. *St. Peter* never suspected *Cornelius*, nor the *Angel St. John*, of mistaking either the one or the other for *God*, or of designing to worship either of 'em as *God*: Yet both express'd a Dislike of the *External Homage*, because given on a *Religious Account*; and the latter advises *St. John* to appropriate all such *External Religious Worship* to *God*. And if our *Blessed Saviour* was no more truly *God*, than either *St. Peter* or the *Angel* (as our *Author* must suppose) he should in all reason have been equally tender of the *Divine Honour*, and refused all *External Acts* that look'd like *Religious Homage*. Much more should he have rejected with the utmost Abhorrence and Zeal the irregular Devotion of such as joined him with the *Father*, in ascribing the same endless *Glory, and Honour, and Power* to the one as to the other. For here there is extreme Danger of such

Doxo

Doxologies leading us into what they account a pernicious Mistake, even to judge the *Father* and the *Son* equal in *Essential Perfections*, when the *same Glory* is ascribed to both in the same Acts of solemn Devotion: Nor would a *good Intention in the Worshipper* at all excuse so gross Imprudence. A Man may bow his Knee both to his *Father* and to his *Prince*. But shou'd he compliment his Father with the same Royal Titles he gives to his Prince, and that in his very Presence, no good Intention of making a Distinction in his own Mind, would excuse his Indiscretion; no more than the *Jews* would have been excusable, if, when they bowed both to *God* and to the *King*, they had used the same *Doxology* to both, and said, *To God and to the King be Glory and Dominion for ever*; and gone about to justify it by pretending, that as *Rational Worshipers* they made a Distinction in their own Minds, and ascribed this endless Glory and Dominion to the *one* and to the *other* in a very different Sense.

Having thus vindicated the *Divine Worship* we give to our *Blessed Saviour*, from the Author's *Objection*, I proceed,

II. To examine the *Grounds* our Adversaries go upon, in the *Worship* they pretend to pay to him.

Now tho' they are all agreed in assigning the same Ground of the *Worship* paid to *Jesus Christ*, viz. *That Authority they suppose him advanc'd to as a dignified Creature*, yet some of 'em think this a sufficient Ground for Giving him *Divine Worship*: Others think it does warrant only the Giving him an *inferior Religious Worship*, but not truly *Divine*.

As to the former of these, there lies an obvious and insuperable Objection against their Practice, *That to give Divine Worship to a Creature, how dignify'd soever, is flat and plain Idolatry, if there be any such thing in the World.* 'Tis the Scriptural Notion of the *Idolatry* of the Gentiles, *That they served the Creature besides the Creator* (a). And that they did Service (or Homage) to those that by Nature were no Gods (b):

(a) Rom. 1. 25.

(b) Gal. 4. 8.

And against this *Idolatry* we are solemnly caution'd in the First Command, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, *Exod. 20. 3.*

Now to avoid the Force of this Argument there are *two* things insisted on by the *Socinians*, which I shall briefly consider.

First, "*They sometimes tell us, they own Christ to be the true God, as that is opposed to all false Gods, and that the most High God hath communicated both his Perfections of Power, Wisdom, &c. and his Authority to him, and therefore his peculiar Honour and Worship too.*"

Ans. That this is a meer Evasion will appear if we consider, that either our Adversaries take such plausible Expressions as these in their proper Sense, or not.

If they take 'em in their proper Sense, the Meaning must be, that the most High God has made the *Man Christ Jesus, Almighty, Omniscient and Supreme Lord of all.* But this is impossible, and no better than horrid Blasphemy. 'Tis to deify a Creature by ascribing infinite Perfections to a finite Being, and setting it in the place of the most High God.

But if they mean no more, by the most High God communicating his Perfections of Power and Wisdom to him, than that he employs his Power to execute what our Lord Jesus would have to be done, and reveals to him all things he is concerned to know: and if they mean no more by his Communicating his Authority to him, than that he has plac'd him in the highest subordinate Dignity; but that still *Jesus Christ* is no more by Nature than a *Man*, and no more possess'd of any Divine Perfections, than *Moses* when God wrought Miracles by him, or the *Prophets* when God revealed Secrets to 'em, (as they must explain the matter if they will speak consistently with themselves) then this no way takes off the Force of the Argument: For then still *Jesus Christ* is by nature no God, he is a Creature, not the Creator: And to give him Divine Worship, while he is such, is in the Language of the Scripture as manifest *Idolatry* as what the *Apostle* charges the *Gentiles* with.

But

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 131

But this leads me to consider their

Second Plea for Giving *Divine Worship* to *Jesus Christ*, tho' they believe him to be no more than a *Man*, viz. That we *Christians* have *God's Command* for doing it, which the *Heathens* never had for the Objects of their Devotion.

To shew the Absurdity of this Plea, I need only suggest ;

1. That this Evasion supposes the Notion of *Idolatry* to depend on a meer *positive Command*, and not on a *Moral*.

Whereas on the contrary, the Notion of *Idolatry* is founded on the *Nature of Things*. The Evil and Malignity of it arises from the manifest Unreasonableness and Incongruity of giving that Honour and Worship, which the *infinite Perfections* and *Supreme Authority* of the *only true God* claim from his *Creatures*, to a *Being* that is *incapable* of those *Perfections*, or of that *Authority*. There is such an infinite Distance and Disproportion between the *Blessed God*, the Creator and Supreme Lord of all, and the most excellent of his *Creatures*, how highly soever dignify'd, that nothing can be more absurd and repugnant to Reason it self, than to give the Respect that belongs to that *Infinite and Sovereign Being*, to any *finite Being whatsoever*. 'Tis most apparently equal and just, that Beings so infinitely different in their Nature shou'd be treated with the greatest Difference possible in the *Respect* that shou'd be paid to 'em. To give the *Infinite God* the same Honour we give to a *finite Being* is (as the Author well argues) to offer him the *biggest Indignity and Affront*. And to give his Worship to such a *finite Being* is to *Deify* it, and make an *Idol* of it. So that God can no more be oppos'd to command us to give *his* Worship to a *creature* how highly dignify'd soever, than he can be oppos'd to command any other thing that is evident-ly *absurd* and unsuitable to the Nature of things. So that our Adversaries are reduc'd to a desperate Shift, when they are forc'd to deny the *Morality of the first Command*, which both the *Jewish* and *Christian*

Church have always look'd upon as of indispensable and perpetual Obligation. And if this be all that *Socinus* meant in charging his *Brethren*, who denied Divine Worship to Christ, with *Judaism*, viz. because they look'd on the First of the Ten Commandments as *Moral*, they need not be ashamed of the Charge, but acted far more consonantly to all sound Reason in denying Divine Worship to Christ while they thought him no more than a dignify'd Man, than *Socinus* in giving it. And indeed while that Command stands in the Decalogue, or till the *Soci-ians* have clearly proved the Repeal of it, they will never reconcile their Practice of setting up two separate Objects of Divine Worship, (One a God by Nature, the other a Man and a God only by Office) with the Command, of having no other God before the Great *Jehovah*. Nor will they ever prove the Repeal of it, while those Words of our Saviour stand upon Record, *Matth. 4. 10. Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* For they clearly demonstrate that the Obligation of the first Command is to us *Christians* perpetual, and never to be superseded.

2. If this Plea were allowable, the *Apostle* fixes his charge against the *Heathens* upon a wrong Foundation.

He charges 'em as *Idolaters* because they Worship'd the Creature besides the Creator, and because they served those that by nature were no Gods. But if the *Socinians* be in the right, There is no harm in that at all: Because if God please to require it, They may give his own Worship to a Creature that is by Nature no more a God than those the Gentiles worshipp'd. (And they themselves suppose that the *Apostle* and the Christian Church gave it to *Jesus Christ*, tho' they apprehended him only to be a dignify'd Creature, and had God's Allowance and Command to do so.) He shou'd therefore have only charg'd 'em with doing it without a warrant and command from the true God. Nay whereas the *Heathens* did many of 'em pretend, That their

ior Gods derived their Dignity from the *Supreme*, and had Divine Honour pay'd 'em *by his Allowance*, the Apostle shou'd have confuted this *Pretence*. So that according to our Adversaries Opinion and Practice, the Apostle makes that *their Crime* that might be equally objected *against himself* and all other Christians, nay supposes it a Sin against the *Light and Law of Nature*, and not against any *positive Command*. As is evident from *Rom. i. 25.* compar'd with the foregoing *ver.*

3. This Plea is inconsistent with God's own most express Declarations.

So that while those Passages stand in the Bible, That God *will not give his Glory to another*, *Is. 42. 8.* That the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens, *Jer. 10. 11.* (which Prediction plainly refers to the time of the Gospel) we can never believe, That God gives his own Glory to a *Dignify'd Man*, and sets up *one* to be worship'd as a God that was so far from *making the Heavens and the Earth*, that according to the Socinians he *did not exist* till about 1700 Years ago. Nay we can never look upon the great *Jehovah* to be, as he so frequently declares himself, *jealous* in the matters of his own Worship, if he admit a Creature to be his *Competitor* or *Associate* in it. *Exod. 20. 5.*

But because the *Author* seems rather to fall in with those Unitarians that deny *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour*, I shall proceed to consider

The Opinion of those Unitarians who think that the Eminent Dignity and Power Jesus Christ is advanced to is a sufficient Ground for giving him an *inferior religious Worship*, tho' not that Worship which is properly *Divine*.

And against this I have these two things to offer.

I. If what has been produc'd from Scripture to prove that truly *Divine Worship* belongs to our *Blessed Saviour*, and that on the account of the truly *Divine Perfections* he is possess'd of, and of the Right he has to it by *Creation and Redemption*, hold

good, Then these *Unitarians* who deny *Divine Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour* are highly injurious to his Honour in refusing to give it, and in putting him off with an *inferior* sort of *Worship*, even such as themselves tell us, may be paid to *Civil Power*, to a *Person in high Office and Dignity*, or to *Prophets and Holy Men*, or to *such as are actually possess'd of the heavenly Beatitudes*. For if an *Higher Worship* be due to him, Those that give him only an *inferior Respect*, do really offer an *Indignity and Affront* to him; and their *Worship* supposes a *falsehood*, and mingles *Reproaches with Praise* (To use the *Author's Expressions*.) But

II. On the other Hand, If our *Blessed Lord* be no more than a *Dignify'd Creature*, even the paying him any *Religious Worship* at all does entrench upon the peculiar Honour of *God*, and is an *Invasion* of his incommunicable Rights.

To make good this Charge, I shall endeavour to shew, That the *Scriptures* appropriate all *Religious Worship* to *God*, and allow of no *inferior Religious Worship* to be given to a *Creature*; and that the Giving a *Religious Worship*, tho' *inferiour*, to *Jesus Christ* on Supposition of his being only a *dignify'd Creature*, will justify both *Pagans* and *Papists* in that *Demon Worship* which the *Scriptures* condemn.

I. The *Scriptures* appropriate all *Religious Worship* to *God*, and allow of no *Inferior Religious Worship* to be given to a *Creature*.

By *Religious Worship* (as oppos'd to *Civil*) I understand such *Worship* as the *Religion* we profess, directs us to pay to some *Inhabitant of the Invisible World*. Now according to the *Christian Religion*, all *Worship* paid to an *Inhabitant of the Invisible World*, is *God's incommunicable due*, and is in the nature of it truly *Divine Worship*, whatever the Intention of those that give it may be. And this will appear if we duly consider, What all *Worship* paid to an *Inhabitant of the Invisible World* supposes in the nature of the *Action* it self. Now it plainly supposes the *Being* to whom we pay such *Worship* to be

present with us, to understand the Homage we pay to him, nay to know not only our particular Case and Circumstances, but even our very Hearts, and with what inward Intentions and Affections we offer such Honour and Respect to him. To pray to such an Invisible Being supposes that he can both bear and help us, and that he can judge of the Sincerity of our Devotions. Now such an Unlimited Knowledge of Humane Affairs and Dominion over 'em, especially such a Knowledge of the Hearts of Men, and such a Presence with all Worshippers where-ever they are, are Perfections that belong to no Inhabitant of the Invisible World but the Blessed God. And 'tis because all Religious Worship does in the nature of the act (whatever be the Intention of the Worshipper) ascribe such Perfections to the Object of it, that God has appropriated all such Religious Worship to himself, and excluded all other Inhabitants of the Invisible World from it. The Author, I presume, will not deny that the Jews understood this to be the true import and sense of the First Command, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.* They paid no Religious Homage to any other Inhabitant of the Invisible World, as reckoning it contrary to this first and greatest Precept of the Decalogue. And 'tis no less certain that the Christian Church, in its first and purest Ages, were of the same Judgment, and disclaim'd on this very Account, the giving Religious Worship to any but God (a). (As I might easily shew by numerous Citations from Justin Martyr, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, and others, if that matter were contested.) And the Judgment both of the Jewish and Christian Church in this point, is abundantly confirm'd by our Blessed Saviour himself: For he plainly declares his own Sentiments of the Latitude and Extent of this Command, when he repell'd the Devil's Temptation to fall down and worship him with this Answer, 'Tis written, *thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him*

(a) The Learned Reader may see this fully prov'd by Dr. Whirby in his *Traclatus de Deitate Christi*, p. 92, 93, 94, &c.

only shalt thou serve, Matth. 4. 10. For whether we suppose our Saviour to refer to the Words of the *First Command*, or to those parallel Passages, *Deut. 6. 13, 14. Deut. 10. 20.* 'tis evident, that he has determin'd this to be the Sense of 'em, *That all Religious Worship and Homage must be given only to God.* And whereas they would evade this plain Declaration by pretending that such Prohibitions of Worshipping any other but God, must be understood of that *Supreme and Absolute Worship*, that is due only to God, but not of an *Inferior and Relative Worship*, which may (as they pretend) be given to a *Dignify'd Creature*: The Vanity of this Evasion appears from this obvious Consideration, that if this Pretence would hold, our *Saviour's* Answer would no way repel the Force of the *Devil's* Temptation: For the *Devil* did not claim *Supreme* and truly *Divine Worship*; but such an *Inferior Respect* as was due to one, who was constituted a God over this lower World, and to whom a Power over all the Kingdoms of it was deliver'd, so that he cou'd give it to whom he wou'd. Nay he demands only a *Relative Worship*, which ultimately referr'd to the Honour of the Giver, See *Luke 4. 6.* And accordingly he offer'd it to our Lord Jesus on Condition of his falling down before him. Now our *Blessed Saviour* does not alledge as a Reason of his Rejecting his Proposal, That the *Devil* did but falsely pretend to any such Power, all the Power he had being only by *Usurpation* and *Divine Sufferance* for wise and holy Ends. (Tho' he might justly have alledg'd this, and shou'd in all Reason, according to our Adversaries, have insisted on this ground for repelling the Temptation.) But he rejects it by telling him, he demanded what was due to God alone, and was his *incommunicable Right*; and what *Satan* cou'd lay no claim to, had his Pretensions of such a Power being deliver'd to him, been never so true. But now according to the *Author's* Opinion, Our *Blessed Saviour* Misapplies this Passage from the Old Testament. For it wou'd not follow, That because we must worship and serve God only (i. e. with *Supreme absolute Worship*) That

we may not therefore fall down to, and pay an *Inferior Religious Worship* to a *Creature* whom God himself has *exalted to high Dignity and Office*. For according to them, 'tis upon this very ground that we must pay *Religious Worship* to our *Blessed Saviour* himself, and the *Devil* here desired it on no other *Ground*. So that if this *Distinction of Religious Worship* into *Supreme and Inferior, Absolute and Relative* be allowable, and we may give the latter to a *Dignify'd Creature*, provided we reserve the former for *God*: Our *Saviour* here gave a very weak insufficient *Answer*, and the *Devil* was a *weaker Disputant*, that you'd not enforce his *Temptation* by the use of so obvious a *Distinction*. Whereas if the Words our *Lord* cites do *appropriate all Religious Worship to God*, then indeed they are every way fit to silence the *Tempter*, by shewing the *Unlawfulness* of what he demanded, even tho' his *Pretensions had been never so true*. Nay, 'tis observable, that to the *Passage*, which our *Saviour* cites out of the *Pentateuch*, he himself has added this *Exclusive Particle only*. *Moses* had said, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him*. And our *Lord*, to render these Words more forcible against the *Devil's Temptation*, cites 'em thus, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*: So that if we will stand to his *Determination*, these Words do appropriate all *Religious Worship* to *God*, and suppose the *Giving it to a Creature* (tho' only on the account of a *Power or Authority* derived from him, and therefore *Inferior and Relative*) to be a *Violation of the Divine Law*.

2. The giving *Religious Worship* to *Jesus Christ*, tho' only *Inferior and Relative*, on the Supposition of his being only a *Dignify'd Creature*, will clear both *Pagans* and *Papists*, in their *Worship of Creatures*, from the Charge of *Idolatry*.

The *Apostle* charges this Crime upon the *Heathens*, because *they worship'd the Creature besides the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen*, (i. e. who is the sole Object of our *Religious Adoration and Praise*) *Rom. 1. 25.* and because *they served those that by Nature were no Gods*, *Gal. 4. 8.* Let

Let us consider, What the *Heathens* reply to this Charge, when manag'd against 'em by those *Fathers* that wrote in Defence of the Christian Cause.

To this purpose they alledge,

" *That those Creatures they worship'd were dii me-*
 " *dioxumi & inferioris notæ, a middle sort of Gods*
 " *of inferior Note, made and advanc'd to that rank*
 " *of Gods, by the Supreme God, who was the God*
 " *of Gods, the King of those Gods and Goddesses,*
 " *that depended on him for all the Dignity they en-*
 " *joy'd; and that these inferior Gods fell so far short*
 " *of the Supreme Deity, that they were rather to be*
 " *reckon'd among Men. That the Worship of these in-*
 " *ferior Gods tended to the Honour of the Supreme,*
 " *from whom they deriv'd this Dignity, and to*
 " *whom it must needs be acceptable and pleasing to pay*
 " *'em this respect. This Worship being agreeable to his*
 " *Orders and Council, and given on the Account of*
 " *that Power and Authority he has vested 'em with,*
 " *and of those Benefits and Blessings he has made 'em*
 " *the Conveyers and Dispensers of* (a).

Now 'tis manifest, That these their Sentiments concerning *Inferior Gods* are very agreeable to those our late *Unitarians* entertain concerning our *Blessed Saviour*, whom they suppose to be only a *Creature*, but constituted a *God*, by being advanc'd to High Dignity by the Supreme God, who has therefore appointed him to be worship'd; the Worship we pay to him redounding to the Glory of the Supreme God, from whom he *derives his Power*, and on whom he *depends* for all the *Dignity* he enjoys.

How then will our *Adversaries* justify the *Apostle's* Charge against the *Heathens*, without exposing their own Cause? For 'tis obvious, That the *Heathens* might retort on the *Apostle*, if he were of the

(a) Senec. Ep. 100. Justin. Mart. Exhort. ad Gr. p. 19, 22. Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 9. c. 3. l. 4. c. 9. l. 8. c. 6. Laët. l. 1. c. 5. Celsus ap. Orig. l. 8. p. 381. & 421. Hierocl. in Carm. Pyth. p. 9, 10, 18. Cels. ap. Orig. l. 7. p. 377. Plato in Phædro, p. 246. Apuleius de Dæm. Socr. p. 45. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 6. p. 631.

same mind with our late Unitarians, How come you to reproach us with *worshipping a Creature beside the Creator*? Do not you Worship such a *Creature* too? Do you not suppose him constituted a *God by Office*, and that the Worship you give him tends to the Honour of the *God of Gods* by whom he is advanc'd to that Dignity? How comes that to be *Idolatry* in us that is none in you? Again, How come you to impute it as a Crime to us that we *serve those that by Nature are no Gods*? Do not you serve and pay Religious Homage to one that is no more a *God by Nature* and Essence, than those we adore? Even to one that is only a *God by Courtesy*, and depends on the *Supreme God* for all the *Power* he is vested with, and all the *Honour* that's paid him?

And if it be said, That *Christians* have the true *God's Command* for worshipping *Christ*, but the *Heathens* had not for worshipping their *Inferior Gods*, (a) the Answer is obvious, That the Apostle shou'd then have fixt his Charge on their doing it *without such a Command* and Warrant from the *true God*, and never made it their Crime to *worship the Creature besides the Creator*, and to *serve such as are not Gods by Nature*: For this it seems may be very *lawful* and *commendable*, when we have *God's Allowance* or *Command* for it; and is only *sinful* when we do it *without his Order*. So that all the fault of the *Heathens* was, That they were mistaken in pretending to such an *Order* from the *Supreme God*, when they really had it not. And what will this lame Excuse it self signify to those *Unitarians*, that tell us, "We have no such *Command* to Worship *Christ* himself, tho' they think it may be lawfully done, and dare not censure those that do it? And as for those other Excuses alledg'd by the foresaid *Author of the Defence of the History of the Unitarians*, viz. "That the *Heathens* set up the *Creature* more than the *Creator*, That they set up an *Infinite Number* of *Gods* who had been meer *Men*, and

(a) Which is the best Excuse made for 'em by the *Author of the Defence of the Hist. of the Unit.* p. 54.

"that

“ that their Worship is terminated on 'em, and so they
 “ made true Gods of Men: It appears by what I have
 already alledg'd from the Patrons of Demon-Wor-
 ship among the *Gentiles*, that they disown'd all this,
 They did not set up Creatures above the Creator
 (which were *Nonsense* as well as *Idolatry*) Nor did they
 suppose their deceased *deify'd Heroes* to be Gods in any
 other Sense than our *Adversaries* suppose the *Man*
Christ Jesus to be. Nor did they so terminate their
 Worship on 'em, as not to refer it to the Honour of
 the God of Gods from whom they suppos'd 'em to re-
 ceive their Power and Dignity. So that our *Unita-*
rians have no way of shewing the Disparity between
 their Practice and that of the *Gentiles*, but by imputing
 to 'em what themselves openly disown. Whereas it ap-
 pears, their Cause is the same by their making use of
 the same Evasions and Distinctions in defence of it.

Upon the like grounds, We charge those of the
Romish Church as Entrenching on the incommunica-
 ble Rights and Honour of God in their *Invocation* of
Angels and glorify'd Saints.

But our Charge is not well grounded, if the Prin-
 ciples of our late *Unitarians* be true. For the *Pa-*
pists may defend their Practice by the same *Princi-*
ples. They assign the like Grounds of their Religi-
 ous Worship to 'em, “ That Angels and glorify'd
 “ Saints are advanc'd to great Dignity and Authority,
 “ That they have both vast Knowledge and vast Pow-
 “ er communicated to 'em; That the Worship they
 “ give 'em is only Inferior and Relative, and redounds
 “ to the Honour of that Supreme God, who has rais-
 “ ed 'em to this Dignity and Glory. And if these
 be solid Grounds of giving an inferior Religious Wor-
 ship to a Creature, What ground is there to reproach
 their Worship as injurious to the Honour of God, and
 an Invasion of his peculiar Rights? So that our late
Unitarians must in this point give up the Cause to
 'em, and must never pretend to charge their Practice
 as *Idolatrous*. And accordingly, The *Apology* which
 the Author of the Defence of the Brief History, &c.
 makes for his Party is very lame. For all he has to

say

ay in the matter is, " That the Papists have no Texts of Scripture which require 'em to Worship St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Francis. Were they content (saith he) to keep within the bounds of Respect and Honour due to glorify'd Saints, they shou'd be guilty of no fault. But to pray to 'em as Mediators both of Intercession and Merit, To dedicate Churches to 'em, To kneel down before their Images, &c. This approaches too near to Idolatry.

Ans^r. We are not here Enquiring whether the Popish Invocation of Angels and Saints be Commanded or Uncommanded, or in what Particulars some may exceed others in it : But whether it be in it self injurious to the Honour of God, and justly condemnable on that account. And if it be not injurious to God's Honour to give Religious Worship to a dignify'd Creature, How can it be prov'd to be so to give it good Angels and glorify'd Saints ? Not only does Socinus assert, That communicated Excellency is a just ground of Worship, but even the Author of the Defence tells us, " That as there are divers Orders of Creatures, so they are to be honour'd in Proportion to their Dignity. And, That if the Papists wou'd keep within the bounds of Respect and Honour due to glorify'd Saints, they shou'd be guilty of no fault. Now the Papists do not deny to Jesus Christ a higher Honour than they give to Angels and glorify'd Saints. What wrong then do they to the Honour of God, in Praying to an Angel or a Saint, if Praying to a Creature be not injurious to his Glory ? If it be said, That their Praying to an Angel or Saint, does in the nature of the Action it self suppose that Angel or Saint to be present with him that Prays, to understand his particular Case, may to know the inward Intentions and Affections of his Heart, and is therefore injurious to the Honour of God, by ascribing to a finite Creature that unlimited Presence and Knowledge that belongs to God alone, and is by the Scriptures (as I have already shewn) frequently appropriated to him ; then the same Charge may be brought against all Religious Worship to Jesus Christ on Supposition of his being only a dignify'd

dignify'd Creature; because on this Supposition, it ascribes to him the peculiar Excellencies of the Divine Nature. Nay if *Socinus* himself, (a) and many of his Followers, besides all the Followers of *Franciscus Davidis*, &c. be in the right; *That we have no Command in Scripture for Praying to Christ, Their Cause* and that of the *Papists* in the *Invocation of Angels and Saints* is every way built on the same Foundation, and must stand or fall with it.

But if the Grounds they go upon be true, What tolerable reason can be given, why the *Angel* shou'd so strictly forbid and caution *St. John* when he fell down to Worship him, *See thou do it not. Worship God*, *Rev. 19. 10. and 22. 9.* Can we think that *St. John*, who knew him to be an *Angel*, intended him any more than an *Inferior Worship*? (And if such *Worship* be allowable to an *Angel* at any time, 'tis when he appears and is present.) Why then shou'd the *Angel* warn him against it, and that by insinuating to him that it wou'd be injurious to God, whom alone he was to pay Religious Homage to?

Upon the whole, The Opinion and Practice of the *Unitarians* plainly re-advances that *Creature-Worship* which it was one great Design of the Christian Religion to overturn and abolish. It undermines that grand Article of the *Everlasting Gospel* that was to be *Preach'd to every Nation, and Kindred, and Tongue, and People; Fear God, and give Glory to him, and the Hour of his Judgment is come, and Worship him that made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea; and the Fountains of Waters*, *Rev. 14. 6, 7.* by setting up as an Object of *Religious Worship* a *Creature* to whom neither the *Divine Perfections* nor *Works* belong.

Having thus clear'd the Arguments for the *Deity of Christ*, drawn from the *Divine Titles, Perfections, Works and Worship* which the Scriptures ascribe to him, from the *Author's Exceptions*; It only remains,

(a) Tho' in this (as *Niemojevius* justly tells him) he had ruin'd his own Cause, by giving those who oppos'd that Divine Worship of Christ which he pleaded for, the greatest Advantage against him.

True Deity of our Blessed Saviour. 143

That I answer those few straggling *Objections* that he has confusely thrown together at the end of his Book.

The most material of 'em is what occurs, p. 17, 18. where he argues against the *Supreme Deity* of Christ from its being inconsistent with his *Office as Mediator*.

To this purpose he argues, "If I must have one who is *Supreme God and Man* for my *Mediator with God*, then when I address to *Jesus Christ as the Supreme God*, where is the *God-man* that must be my *Mediator with him*? To say he mediates with himself, is the same as to say I must go to him without a *Mediator*, &c. But the *Scriptures* speak of a *Mediator without a God*, And who is this *Mediator*, if we go to *Jesus Christ as the ultimate Object*?

Ans. All the force of this *Objection* lies in the Obscurity and Ambiguity of it. And I need do no more to discover the weakness of it, than to distinguish those several acts of Mediation which the *Author's* *Objection* confounds, and to shew what distinct part his *Divine* and *Humane* Nature act therein.

We believe, as well as the *Author*, That there is one *God*, and one *Mediator with God*, the *Man Christ Jesus*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 4. And to understand his *Mediation* right, we must consider, That it may either respect his *Priestly* or *Kingly* Office.

As his *Mediation* respects his *Priestly* Office, (and to this alone the *Author's* *Objection* refers) there are two Branches of it; the one perform'd on *Earth*: the other in *Heaven*. On the *Earth* He offer'd Himself an *Atoning Sacrifice* for us; In *Heaven* he appears for us in the presence of *God* as our *Intercessor* and *Advocate*. Now we grant it was the *Man Jesus Christ*, that became by his voluntary *Sufferings* and *Death* our *Atoning Sacrifice*. And to this *Act* of *Mediation* the *Eternal Son of God* concurred, by freely delivering up that *Humane Nature* he had assum'd to so stupendous *Sufferings*, and by giving a sufficient *Dignity* and *Merit* to those *Sufferings* to render 'em valuable *Consideration* for our *Impunity*. And on that account the *Apostle Paul* speaks of the *Church of God*

God as purchas'd with his own Blood, Acts 20. 28. Again, We grant that the Man Jesus Christ does now appear in the presence of God, as our Intercessor and Advocate with the Father. But we believe, that the Eternal Word to which that Humane Nature was united, as it gave a sufficient Value to his Sufferings, so it consequently gives a sufficient Efficacy to his Intercession.

Now we may justly enquire of the Author, Why the Man Jesus Christ shou'd be less capable of either offering himself an Atoning Sacrifice, or of appearing in the Divine Presence as our successful Advocate with the Father on the account of his Union to the Eternal Word? And why may not the Man Christ Jesus, in such a Concurrence with the Eternal Son of God, thus mediate with the Father, who (as I have before suggested) does in this Oeconomy sustain the Character of Supreme Lawgiver, without supposing that God mediates with himself; if by Mediation the Author intend either Dying as our Propitiation, or appearing in the Divine Presence in the heavenly Sanctuary with the Blood of Attonement? For these are acts in which the Humane Nature is the immediate Principle and Agent, tho' they are ascrib'd to the Person of our Lord Jesus. And sure we may easily conceive how these Acts should derive a higher Value from the Union of that Humane Nature to the Eternal Word. But against this the Author Objects,

" If it be said, His Humane Nature only acts in this
 " Mediation, tho' as united to the Divine, I answer,
 " That as this is still to make Christ Mediator with
 " himself, so the Humane Nature is not God-man. And
 " if the Man or Humane Nature alone be capable of do-
 " ing the part of a Mediator, then'tis not necessary that
 " Jesus Christ shou'd be more than a Man inhabited by
 " and related to God in order to that Office. Nor may
 " it be said, That the Union to the Divine Nature,
 " gives an infinite Efficacy to those Acts of which the Hu-
 " mane only is the Principle; For unless by that Union
 " the Humane Nature was turn'd into an Infinite or
 " Divine Nature, its Acts can no more be reckon'd
 intrin

“intrinsically and properly infinite, than his Body or Understanding are infinite because so united to an infinite Nature.

Ans. We do not say, *The Humane Nature only acts in this Mediation*, Because we suppose the *Divine Nature* of our Lord to Consent to, and communicate a Dignity and Value to the Sufferings of his *Humane*, and to contribute thereby to the Prevalency of his Intercession. And it will not thence follow, That our Lord *Jesus Mediates with himself*, but only with the *Father*. Nor will it follow, That the Mediator is not God as well as Man, Or that the *Humane Nature alone can do the Part of a Mediator*, and That therefore it is not necessary that *Jesus Christ shou'd be more than a Man inhabited by and related to God in order to that Office*. A Prophet or Apostle, nay every good Man, is *Inhabited by and related to God*: And yet, supposing 'em as sinless as our Lord himself, the Blood of such a one cou'd never have been a valuable Consideration for the Redemption of Mankind; it cou'd never have been an Effectual Propitiation for Sin, or a sufficient Ransom to purchase the Church of God: And we cou'd have had no solid ground to depend upon any Intercession in the Vertue of it. But we can depend on the Sacrifice and Intercession of that *Humane Nature* which the *Eternal Son of God* assum'd, and to whose Sufferings it cou'd consent and communicate a sufficient value for answering all the Ends of the Divine Government. And we do not, as the Author pretends, assert, That the *Acts of Christ's Humane Nature become properly and intrinsically infinite by its Union to the Divine* (for that's impossible); But only that hereby they become of *Infinite or unconceivable, and all-sufficient value*. The Dignity of our Lord's *Divine Person* giving a value to those acts of which the *Humane Nature* is the immediate Principle.

But our Author pretends to demonstrate, That Christ's *Humane Nature* can never be an Effectual Mediator (according to our Judgment) even tho' personally united to the *Divine*. Because (he saith)

L

“We

“ *We deny this Humane Nature so united to have the*
 “ *Knowledge of the Secret Mental Prayers, the inward*
 “ *desires and distresses of all Christians, or to know a-*
 “ *ny ones Heart. And how then can he be a Compas-*
 “ *sionate Intercessor in Cases that he knows nothing of?*
 “ *Or how can he have a fellow-feeling of their Suffer-*
 “ *ings which he knows not that they feel at all? What*
 “ *comfort is there in this account of Christ's Mediation?*

Ans. Either the *Author* speaks of an *immediate* Knowledge of our mental Prayers; of our inward Desires and our very Hearts: or a Knowledge by *Revelation*. As to the *former*, I have shewn him, That the Scriptures every where appropriate it to God. As to the *latter*, Why may not *we* suppose as much of this kind reveal'd to Christ's *Humane Nature*, and that in consistency with our Doctrine, as *he*? Will *Christ's Humane Nature* have the less reveal'd to it, because 'tis personally united to the *Eternal Word*? So that if his *Humane Nature* be capable of such an Universal Knowledge of all our particular Cases *by Revelation*, *we* have as much reason to suppose it as *he*, and are willing to suppose as much Knowledge of that kind communicated to it by *Revelation*, as can agree to the finite Capacity of his *Humane Soul*. If *it be not*, our *Author* is as much concern'd to answer this *Objection* as *we* are. And upon this Supposition, it must be answer'd by asserting, That as by one and the same act he offer'd himself a Sacrifice for all, the virtue whereof is applicable to every true Christian in particular: So his Intercession, so far as his *Humane Nature* acts therein, consists in his appearing in the Divine Presence in the heavenly Sanctuary, (as the High-Priest did in the Holy of Holies with the Names of the Twelve Tribes Engraven on his Breast-Plate,) the benefit whereof every true Christian as truly reaps as if his particular Case were truly known to Christ's *Humane Soul*: Because in his Divine Nature our Lord does understand their particular Cases, and can apply suitable Relief to 'em. But if his *Humane Soul* be capable of a more comprehensive and particular Know-

ledge

ledge by Revelation, 'tis every way as consistent with our Doctrine as with his, or rather more.

But (saith our Author) "*The Divine Nature is precluded from it, because they direct us to seek to that as the ultimate Object thro' a Mediator, and the Humane Nature (they say) may know nothing of our Case, nor knows our Hearts, whether we Worship and Repent sincerely, or only hypocritically, and so knows not how to represent or recommend us to God. What a Case now do these Men bring us into? There is no Mediator left to interpose with the Supreme God, so that we must deal with him immediately and alone, which they will own is far from the Gospel-Doctrine or Method. Thus is our Lord Jesus turned out of Office, on pretence of giving him higher Honour.*"

Ans. 'Tis often harder to understand the Author's Argument than to answer it. What does he mean by saying, *That the Divine Nature is precluded from it?* Is it precluded from the Knowledge of our Hearts? No, sure; for we attribute to that alone the immediate Knowledge of 'em. And what tho' the *Divine Nature*, as it subsists in the *Father*, be the ultimate Object of our Addresses, will it thence follow, that the same *Divine Nature* in the *Son* cannot reveal to the *Human Nature* it has assum'd all the Knowledge of our particular Cases, and of our very Hearts, that such a finite Nature is capable of? And if it be capable of knowing 'em all by Revelation, then our Author's Objection vanishes; if it be not, he is (as I have shewn) as much concern'd to answer it as we. And now let him review upon what Ground he so mainly insults, when he saith, *What a Case now do these Men bring us unto? &c.* We do as much assert with the Apostle as he, *That the Man Christ Jesus is our Mediator with God*; So that we do not deal immediately with him. And we suppose him the more capable to mediate effectually, because we believe the *Humane Nature* assum'd into a personal Union with the *Son of God*. Because the Dignity of his Person is capable of giving a *Value* and *Merit* to his

Sacrifice, and a *Prevalency* to his *Intercession*. But let him consider into what a Case he brings us, who asserts what the Apostle *Paul* never did, *That our Mediator is only a Man*. And what is there in the Life of a meer Man to render it a sufficient Ransom for all? What value is there in the *Blood* of such a one to *Purchase the Church of God*? What *Efficacy* or *Merit* is there in such a *Sacrifice* to expiate and take away the guilt of Sin, or obtain *Eternal Redemption* for us? And if there be no sufficient *Virtue* or *Value* in *that*, There can be as little *Prevalency* in his *Intercession*. So that all the Question amounts to this, Whether the *Man Christ Jesus* is more capable of being an effectual *Mediator* with the *Father*, consider'd as United to and acting in Concurrence with and Subordination to the *Eternal Son of God*; or consider'd as destitute of any such *Union* and *Relation*? And that the Apostle never intended by calling the *Mediator* the *Man Christ Jesus* to exclude his *Divine Nature*, is so evident from his describing him elsewhere as not only the *Seed of Abraham*, but *God over all blessed for evermore*, and by telling us *That the Church of God was purchased with his own Blood*, that the *Author* has highly injur'd him by so grossly misinterpreting his Words; We are very willing to stand to the *Apostle's* account of this matter at 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. if the *Author* will but allow him to be his own *Interpreter* at *Rom.* 9. 5. *Acts* 20. 28.

And what I have said does sufficiently obviate what he only repeats, " *That they who hold true to the Unity of the Divine Nature, or one infinite Being under three Modes, Properties or Relations; do by plain Consequence leave no place for such a Mediator as they require, viz. One who is an infinite God to be Mediator with the infinite God, when there is no infinite Being but his own, and he cannot be thought to intercede with himself neither.* All this Objection turns upon the *Author's* not allowing such a Distinction in the *Divine Nature* as we suppose to be between the *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*,

Spirit, and not distinguishing between those Acts of which the *Divine Nature*, and those of which the *Humane* is the immediate Principle, of which Acts belonging to the latter, this of *Intercession* mentioned is one. And if these Distinctions be made, why may not the *Man Christ Jesus*, and that as united to the *Divine Nature* in its second manner of Subsistence and Operation (or in the *Person of the Son*) both offer up himself as a *Sacrifice on Earth*, and appear in the *Divine Presence in Heaven* as our *Advocate with the Father*? Nay, how infinitely greater Reason have we to expect that his *Mediation* will be Efficacious and Successful on this Supposition, than if with the *Author*, we suppose him to be *only a Man*?

I shou'd here add, That as to that part of Christ's *Mediation* which respects his *Kingly Office*, and which the *Author's* Objection seems not to refer to, viz. His dispensing to us all Benefits and Blessings from the *Father* by his Royal Power; it does more fully appear, That the Discharge of it does require an Unlimited and *Divine Power*, and cannot be performed by one that is a *meer Man*. How can a *meer Man* be the *Head* of all vital Influences to all the Members of his *Mystical Body*? or exercise an Universal Providence and Care over all the Affairs both of the *Church* and the *World*?

The *Author* at p. 18, 19. refers us for an Account of Christ to St. *Peter's* magnificent Description of him at the Day of Pentecost, before his Murderers themselves, Acts 2. 22. *Ye Men of Israel, hear these Words, Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approv'd of God among you by Wonders, Miracles and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.* Again at ver. 36. *Let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucify'd, both Lord and Christ.* Now the *Author* infers, "Why shou'd the *Apostle*, if he had believ'd the Infinite Deity of Christ, leave out that most Emphatical Branch in the Description of him, that was the most terrifying Argument, and most capable to convince his Persecutors, &c. viz. That they had shed the Blood

“ of the Infinite God himself? *Whereas what he saith is flat and low in Comparison of this.*

Ans. All the Force of this Argument turns upon this Supposition, That the Apostle design'd in these Words to describe our *Blessed Saviour* by the highest Characters that belong to him: But this I deny: It was only his Design to represent and prove *Christ* to have been the *true Messiah*, whom they had unjustly crucify'd; and that it self was sufficient to strike Horror into their Consciences: But it was not his Design to instruct 'em in all the *Dignity* of the *Messiah*. For if it was, why does not the Apostle tell 'em, they had shed the Blood of him, that was of the *Fathers* according to the *Flesh*, and was over all God blessed for evermore; nay, of him in whom the *Fulness* of the *Godhead* dwells bodily; nay, of him who is the *Brightness* of the *Father's* *Glory*, and the express *Image* of his *Person*, by whom he made the *World*? For these are Characters of *Christ* deliver'd by other Inspired Writers, and more magnificent ones than what the Apostle *Peter* here lays down. And shall we expunge 'em out of the Bible, because the Apostle *Peter* thought not fit to mention 'em in this Description? Nay, our *Author* does not consider that this Argument is as strong against himself. He seems to own that *Christ* had a *pre-existent Nature*, at p. 2. And he supposes him, *One by whom God made the Worlds, as his Instrument*: Nay, as *One far above Angels and Arch-Angels, and over all Powers in Heaven and Earth, A God or Ruler, and the great Administrator of God's Kingdom, both in the Visible and the Invisible World*, at p. 21. And if the Apostle *Peter* believed all this, was it not as necessary and as proper to have suggested such Characters of our *Lord Jesus* as these, to strike the greater Horror of their Crime into the Hearts of his Murtherers? Is not his calling him a *Man* approv'd of God, &c. all low and flat in comparison of this? Does he not see that this Argument will be as strong in the Mouth of a *Socinian* against *Christ's* having a *pre-existent Nature*, as 'tis in his against his having a *Divine Nature*? And how does

does he prove, what he takes for granted, That the Apostle baptiz'd those he converted without ever instructing 'em in this Article of our *Lord's Divinity*? Especially since we are told, that 'tis only a part of his Discourse to 'em that is there related. Nay, I might here suggest to our *Author* that tho' the Apostle *Peter* does not mention the *Divinity of Christ* as an Aggravation of the Crime of his Murtherers, who perhaps did not understand that their expected *Messiah* was to be *God* as well as *Man*; yet another Apostle reminds 'em of it, when he tells 'em, *That had they known they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory*, 1 Cor. 2. 8. a Title often given to the great *Jehovah*, and alluding to the *Shecinah*, or visible Appearance of Divine Glory under the Old Testament: Nay, the same Apostle calls the *Blood of Christ* the *Blood of God*, because it was the *Blood* of him that was *God* as well as *Man*, *Acts* 20. 28.

And the same Answer to this Text, *Acts* 2. 22. may serve to that Text he only mentions, *Acts* 10. 38.

He next adds, "*That God and Christ are two Disparates or different things, as much as Christ's Body and Bread are, and cannot be predicated of one another in a proper Sense, or without a Figure.*"

Ans. That *God* and the *Man Christ Jesus* are different things we grant him, and that they cannot be predicated of one another in a proper Sense. But what signifies this to prove, That the *Eternal Word* that was made *Flesh* is not *God*?

Why he tells us, "*To be anointed imports to be rais'd by Authority and Honour conferr'd, 'tis in effect to say, the Person is a Creature or inferior Being: And therefore to say, That Christ is most High God, is to say the inferior is supreme, and the Man is God.*"

Ans. How miserable Trifling is this? When the *Author* knows that *Christ* or *Anointed* is only a Name, that tho' given to his *Person*, immediately refers to his *Humane Nature* as qualify'd for his *Offices of Prophet, Priest, &c.* Can it be thence inferr'd, That he has no other *Nature* than that? We'll grant him, if it will do his Cause any Service, that the *Man thus a-*

nointed is only a Creature and an inferior Being, and as such not the most High God : But will it therefore follow, that the Word or Son of God, that assum'd and acted that Human Nature, is not the most High God ?

“ But (saith he) if the Business may be solv'd here
 “ by making a personal Union between God and Christ,
 “ I see not why the Papists may not set up such an Union
 “ between Christ's Body and the Bread in the Eucharist,
 “ and then stoutly defend, That'tis the Body of Christ.

Ans. If the Author here argue at all, 'tis thus :
 If Christ's Human Nature may be personally united to the Eternal Word, so that he may be God as well as Man, then Christ's Body and the Bread in the Sacrament may be so united, that the Bread may be his Body. But what Union will the Author find out for us to make good so strange a Consequence ? Do we suppose Christ's Human Nature transubstantiated or chang'd into the Divine, as the Papists suppose the Bread to be into Christ's Body ? Or wou'd the Union of the Divine to the Human Nature, infer such a Penetration of Bodies, and all other Contradictions to Sense in a proper Object of Sense, that wou'd follow upon the Union of Christ's Body to all the Consecrated Wafers on the Romish Altars ?

And yet the Author is so pleas'd with this Shadow of an Argument, that it leads him into a long Digression concerning the Unsteadiness of many Protestant Writers, in which he wou'd perswade us, “ That
 “ the Protestants when they have answered the Papists,
 “ are forced to use those very Popish Arguments they
 “ had baffled against the Unitarians.

Let us take a short View of his Allegations.

“ Thus (he saith) we answer the Papist's Charge of
 “ Novelty by telling'em, our Religion was in the Bible,
 “ and yet object that very Novelty to the Unitarians.

Ans. We do not barely tell the Papists that our Religion was in the Bible : But that the Substance of it has continued and been professed ever since. That Popery is a Mass of corrupt Additions to it which gradually crept in, all or most of which were
 utterly

utterly unknown to the 3 first Ages, nay, many of 'em were not introduc'd till the 7th, 8th, some not 'till the 12th Age, nay many of 'em were not authoriz'd by any *General Council* (as they vainly call their pack'd Assemblies) 'till that scandalous one at *Trent*. Nay, the chief Doctrine of Popery, the *Papal Headship*, seems not to have been generally own'd in the *Romanish Church* for 1000 Years after *Christ*, and never by the *Eastern Churches* at all.

And why may we not in Consistency with all this, object to the *Unitarians*, That as their Doctrine is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, so 'tis to the concurrent Judgment of the *Universal Church* (both in *East* and *West*) for so many Ages? Is there no Weight in such a Consideration? Shou'd it not make any wise Man cautious of rejecting an Article which the whole *Christian Church* has for so many Ages taken to be so important a part of her *Creed*? And the contrary Doctrine whereto never pass'd in any Age without *publick Censure*? But the *Author* wrongs us if he pretends, That we lay the main Stress of our Cause here.

Again, he saith, "*We prove that the Elements in the Eucharist are not Christ's Body and Blood, because they are by the Fathers call'd the Images thereof: But we will not allow the Unitarians Argument, That Christ is not the most High God, because the Scriptures call him his Image.*"

Ans. And does the *Author* think there is no Difference between the Notion of an *Image* when apply'd to a *Bodily Substance*, and when apply'd to an *Infinite Invisible Spirit*? And will it follow, That an *Image* when apply'd to the latter, imports a *differing Being* from that whose *Image* it is, because it does import so when apply'd to the former?

Again, he tells us, "*That we prove against the Papists, that St. Peter was inferior to the Church and the rest of the Apostles, because he was sent up and down by 'em; But we will not allow this Argument when brought to prove that the Son is inferior to the Father.*"

Ans.

Ans. St. Peter's being sent by the Church was never brought by any Man in his Wits as an Argument to prove, that he was *inferior* either to the Church or to the *Apostles* in respect of his *Nature* and *Essence* as a *Man* : Nor indeed does it prove his being inferior in *Office* and *Dignity* to any of the rest of the *Apostles*. No more then can the *Son's* being sent by the *Father* prove his being *inferior* to him in respect of his *Nature* and *Essence*, which is the *Equality* we assert ; and yet if it will do our *Author* any Service, we will allow that it proves what St. Peter's being sent does not, *viz.* The *Son* to be in respect of *Office* inferior to the *Father* ; the *Father* sustaining the Character of *Supreme Lawgiver*, the *Son* of *Mediator* in the Oeconomy of our Salvation. So unhappy is the *Author* in the Choice of his Arguments, that to increase their Number he brings in such as directly make against *himself*.

Once more he tells us, "*That against the Papists we urge People to enquire into, and to examine the Matters in Dispute. But when we have to do with the Unitarians we tack about, and bid 'em beware of Reading and Disputing, and are for implicit Faith.*"

Ans. The *Author* may see by this Answer (wherein he will find the most of his Book repeated *Verbatim*, and I am sure not one Argument of any Moment omitted) that we are not ashamed of bringing our Cause to the Light ; and are far from either *hoodwinking the People in Ignorance*, or *urging 'em to an implicit Faith*. We are not only willing but desirous they shou'd compare our Doctrine in this Article with that of the *Holy Scriptures*. But I hope the *Author* does not expect we shou'd advise every private Christian, that is under no Doubts in reference to his Christian Faith, or to this Article of it, to read all the Pamphlets wrote of late by the *Deists* and *Unitarians*, that tend to unhinge and unsettle his Mind in reference to the Truth of the Christian Religion, or of this particular Branch of it. Much less can he expect we should advise 'em to read those pernicious *Papers*, without reading any *Answers* to 'em ;

no more than we wou'd advise 'em to venture on *Poyson* without an *Antidote*.

And whereas he tells us, "*That upon Protestant Principles the Unitarians can stand their Ground, and defend themselves as well as the Protestants can against the Papists* : I think our *Unitarians* shou'd not boast so much of their *Protestant Principles*, when in that important Point of *Giving Religious Worship to a Creature*, they have so manifestly given up the Cause to the *Papists*, and clear'd 'em from the Charge of *Idolatry* in their *Religious Invocation of Angels and glorify'd Saints*. But I must tell him, That as our *Protestant Doctrine* that appropriates all *Religious Worship* to God, will stand as long as the Bible does ; so it will overturn theirs, that give that *Religious Worship* to our *Saviour*, while they believe him to be no more than a *Dignify'd Creature*. And all their baffled Distinctions of *Supreme or Inferior, Absolute and Ultimate or Relative Worship*, which in this Point they borrow from the *Papists* (and which are the Plaisters they use to cover this Sore) will never be able to support it. And I desire the *Author* to set this one solid Proof of *his Party's Unsteadiness to the Protestant Cause*, against all the imaginary Instances of *ours* that he has here alledg'd.

As to *Primitive Antiquity*, if the *Author* have a mind to try his Skill he may enter the Lists on this Head either with Dr. *Bull* or with the *Bishop of Worcester* in his late *Vindication of the Trinity*. (For I hope he will never take the Triflings of his Answerer in the 4th Collect. of Unit. Tracts for a Reply to it.) Or even with Dr. *Whitby* in the few Citations he has from the *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, in his *Tractatus de Deitate Christi*. And when he produces any thing of Moment against the *Authorities* they alledge, he may expect it will be fairly consider'd. 'Till then, I shall only tell the *Author* that we can have no Veneration for the great Defenders of the Christian Cause, if they so grossly abus'd and strain'd their Eloquence as to equal a *Creature* to the *Eternal God*. And on the other hand, their equalling *Christ* with the *Father* in respect

respect of his *Essence* is not inconsistent with their asserting him to be *inferior* in respect of *Office*, by a voluntary Dispensation, as he may see at p. 24, &c.

As to the *Author's* Profession of his own Sincerity in what he writes, I do not pretend to judge him. To his own Master he stands or falls. I shall therefore only observe, that in his Description of our Saviour's Offices he has left out his being our *Propitiation* or *attoning Sacrifice*: And that he might still have believ'd the *Father to be greater than Christ*, and *God to be the Head of Christ* (in the Sense already explain'd) without such a bold and dangerous Attempt as this, to derogate from his Honour as *God ever all blessed for evermore*.

As to the *Charity* he recommends to us at p. 21. from the Example of *Justin Martyr*, I shall only say, that we are willing to extend it as far as Reason will allow. But he must excuse us that we dare not trust in any as our *Saviour* who is not the *Supreme God*. See *Tit. 2. 14.* compar'd with *Isa. 14. 21, 22.* *There is no God else besides me, a just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me: Look unto me, and be ye saved all the Ends of the Earth; for I am God, and there is none else.* And the Reader may compare the following *Verse* with *Rom. 14. 11.* to convince him that 'tis our Lord Jesus the Prophet there intends: See what is said above at p. 124. And we must add, that it would extreamly weaken the Veneration we have for our *Blessed Saviour* and his Apostles, if he should be proved to be a meer dignify'd Creature. For we cannot see how he can be excus'd from affecting *Divine Honour* himself; or the Apostles from countenancing our giving it to him. And we judge, that the degrading him to the Rank of a dignify'd Creature does most effectually expose him to the Scorn of Infidels, as a vain Usurper of the peculiar Rights and Glory of the great *Jehovah*. So that we think it every Way safest to adhere to the Faith and Practice of *Justin Martyr* (how far soever we may stretch our Charity to those that differ from us in so important an Article) when he saith, "We
" (*Chri-*

“ (*Christians*) worship and adore the Father, and
 “ the Son that came from him, and taught us these
 “ things, &c. and the Spirit of Prophecy, honour-
 “ ing 'em in Word and Truth. *Apol. 2. p. 56. C.*

Christ crucify'd is no Stumbling-block to us (as the Author groundlessly suggests). But yet we cannot reconcile many of those *Characters* the *Author* here gives him with the Opinion of his being no more than a *dignify'd Creature*. We cannot allow such a Creature to be the *Maker of the Worlds*; for what our *Author* adds, of his being an *Instrument in making 'em*, is a Notion that destroys it self (as I have shewn at p. 64.) Nor can we believe him to be a meer Creature in whom the Fulness of the Godhead dwells; and who is One with the Father; (not One in Consent, but One in Energy and Power, as I have shewn the Context explains it at *John 10. 30.* compar'd with *Ver. 38.*) Who is far above all *Angels and Arch-angels*, being the Object of their Worship; who is the great Administrator of the Divine Kingdom both in the visible and invisible World. And we think it far more absurd to give these Characters to a meer dignify'd Creature, than (what the *Author* with so daring a Presumption represents as the most compleat Absurdity) to assert, That *Christ* is the same Supreme God, (i. e. the same in Nature and Essence) with the Father, whose Son and Image he is. This is so far from being absurd, that our *Blessed Saviour* cannot be his Son (in a Sense peculiar to himself, and incommunicable to any other, or, as the Scriptures speak, his only-begotten Son) without a Participation of his Nature, and the essential Perfections thereof. Nor can he without it be the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person (or Subsistence) as he is call'd, *Heb. 1. 2.* (Not a visible Image, as the *Author* groundlessly supposes). But to give these foremention'd Characters to a meer exalted Man, plainly confounds God and Man, Finite and Infinite, the Creator and the Work of his Hands, which is another kind of Absurdity than to suppose such a Distinction in the infinite yet undivided Nature

ture of God, as the Doctrine of the *Trinity* implies. And if the *Author* thinks this a *grievous Offence*, we cannot help it: But we think it a more *real* and *grievous Offence*, that a professed Minister of our *Lord Jesus* should rob him of the Glory of his Essential Deity, the Denial whereof we apprehend *obscures* the Glory of that marvellous *Wisdom* and *Grace* that are so conspicuously display'd in the *Gospel*, and takes away from that Divine Institution what appears most *amiable* in it, even the unparalleled Condescension and Love of the *Eternal Son* of God in his *Incarnation* and *Sufferings* for the Salvation of the Sons of Men.

And for what the *Author* suggests, "That this
" *Doctrine of the Incarnation of God* (*i. e.* of God
" the Son) *hinders the Progress of the Gospel*, and
" *occasions the Rejection of it by Jews, Mahometans,*
" *and Pagans*: I am so far from being of his Mind, that I know nothing (except *Popery*) more likely to obstruct the Progress of it than the Opposition of our late *Unitarians* to this Article of our Religion. For the *Jews*, who believ'd the extraordinary Presence of God in the *Cloud of Glory* both in the *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, it can be no reasonable Objection to them against the Gospel, that God should be *manifested in the Flesh*, and dwell in that more perfect *Tabernacle* or *Temple* of an *Human Soul and Body*: And for the *Ancient Jews*, our *Author* would do well to consider what Bishop *Kidder*, in his *Demonstration of the Messiah*, has offer'd to shew, that they had some obscurer Notices of the Christian Doctrine in reference to the *Trinity*, and particularly the Divinity of the *Word* (a). For *Pagans*, their frequent Relations of the *Descent* of their Gods should render the *Incarnation of God* no way incredible to 'em; and what the greatest of their *Philosophers* has deliver'd concerning a *Trinity of Principles* in the *Divine Nature*, should rather facilitate than

(a) See Part III. Chap. IV, V, VI.

than obstruct their Belief of what we suppose the Gospel to declare concerning it. For *Mahometans* indeed, this Doctrine may be a *Stumbling-block* in their Way; for their great *Prophet* has taught 'em an invincible Reason against God's having a *Son*, because *he never had a Wife*: So gross and stupid were the Apprehensions of that vile *Impostor*. But yet tho' a Coalition between the *Mahometans* and *Unitarians* may at first View seem easy and practicable, because they both perfectly agree in their Opinion of *Jesus Christ*, That he was the Son of *Mary*, and a Great *Prophet*, but by no means the Son of God by Participation of the Divine Nature; yet there are two things in the *Unitarian* Scheme that will be as great a *Stumbling-block* to the *Mahometans* as he supposes the *Incarnation* of God to be. The One is, their making *Christ* a God by Office, and paying Religious Worship to him, at the same Time that they own him to be no more than a *Creature*. And in this Point the *Mahometans* have certainly the Advantage, that they own none as God but one, and worship no other Being, not *Mahomet* himself whom they suppose the greatest of Prophets. The Other, that the *Unitarians* own the Truth of *Christ's Crucifixion* (tho' they deny the principal End of it.) And this it self is a great *Stumbling-block* to that ignorant but proud People, who cannot admit it into their Thoughts, that God should permit so great a Prophet as *Jesus Christ* to suffer such Indignity from so despicable Wretches as they esteem the *Jews* to be. And for the *Jews* themselves, the giving Religious Worship to *Christ* as a *Deputy-God*, is such a *Scandal* to them as can never be removed while the *First Command* stands in the *Decalogue*. But for the *Pagans*, the *Unitarians* may hope for the greatest Harvest of *Profelytes* among them: For they have been so kind as to justify their *Demon-Worship* from all Charge of *Idolatry*; and to oblige 'em the more, they have expung'd out of the *Christian Religion* all its peculiar *Mysteries*, leaving little in it but the Principles of *Natural Religion*.

ligion. So that the *Pagans* have now only the Doctrine of the *Cross* to get over. And as to that, they are told, That *Christ* died chiefly to bear witness to those Principles their own *Moralists* had taught before him, concerning *another Life*. For the *Christian Religion* (saith a late *Unitarian Writer*) is nothing properly but *Natural Religion*, whose *Light* *Sin* had almost *extinguish'd*. And *God*, to give it its first *Splendor*, yields up *Christ* to *Death*. See *Scandal and Folly of the Cross removed*, p. 20. And what should hinder *Pagans* from embracing *Christianity*, when 'tis presented to 'em in so agreeable a Dress, being really no other than *Paganism refin'd and reviv'd*? See the *Preface*.

Upon the whole, We are for taking *Christianity* as laid down in the *Bible*, and dare not abandon any of its *sacred Truths*, how *sublime* and *mysterious* soever, to accommodate it to the *Gust* of *Infidels*. And therefore we dare not, to please them, deny the *Essential Deity and Glory* of the *Lord that bought us*; nor are we ashamed to own him as *Supreme God* whom we own as the *Maker*, and *Ruler*, and *Judge* of the *World*, the *Lord of the Quick and the Dead*. So that we can in entire *Consonancy* with our Principles offer that *Doxology* to our *Blessed Saviour*, with which the *Author* concludes his *Book*, (tho' according to *his* we cannot see how he will clear that *Practice* from the Charge of *Idolatry*) *Unto him that loved us, and wash'd us from our Sins in his own Blood, and has made us Kings and Priests to God and his Father, even to him be Glory and Dominion for ever, Amen*, Rev. i. 6.

F I N I S.

Do-
they
efs to
at be-
Chri-
is no-
ot Sin
s frst
al and
hould
en 'tis
real-
See

ianity
n any
s fo-
And
e Ef-
t us;
God
udge
Dead.
rin-
our,
tho
lear
him
own
and
for